

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue in place of Hon. Guy T. Helvering, whose nomination for a Federal judgeship in Kansas has been confirmed.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. John Russell Deane (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE
Amos E. Taylor, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Oliver P. Hopkins to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
Raymond C. Miller to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman	George W. Comstock
Kenneth Grant	Anthony J. Lund
James Lloyd Elliott	Herbert Tabor
Herbert E. Pedersen	Robert M. Thomas
Joseph L. Bryant	Spurgeon M. Wingo

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Romeo J. Gentile	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
George K. Massengill	Charles M. McGill
David J. Zaugg	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Frank S. Fellows	Jacob P. Eberhardt
Elmer A. Carberry	Anthony P. Rubino

William C. Lewis to be a temporary passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman
Kenneth M. Joye
John A. Lewis
Joseph A. Bell to be a temporary senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Robert H. Onstott to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Elmer J. Herringer to be a sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Gordon E. McCallum to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

Edmund J. Schmidt to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

George Shipman to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs	Emery F. Word
Carruth J. Wagner	Lyman C. Burgess

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin	Eric C. Johnson
Erwin C. Drescher	Earl L. White
Paul T. Erickson	Joseph S. Spoto
John B. Hozier	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney
Robert H. Felix

To be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.
Raymond A. Vonderlehr to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943.
Calvin B. Spencer to be a surgeon, to rank as such from October 8, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Stella K. Martin, Plantersville.
Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blockton.

KANSAS

Regina Cannon, Beattie.
Clara Sainer, Bison.
Nina Short, Concordia.
Mary E. Carpenter, Goddard.
Herbert E. Walter, Kingman.

KENTUCKY

Charles B. Cox, Benton.
Kenneth T. Marquette, Falmouth.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer.
Curtis L. Wright, Michigan.
Nick F. Schammel, Tolley.

RHODE ISLAND

Elton L. Clark, North Scituate.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray E. Young, Due West.
Andrew M. Blair, Rion.
William F. Griffin, Travellers Rest.

WEST VIRGINIA

J. B. Puryear, Jr., Holden.
Martha J. Snyder, Shepherdstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for our country; it is an ideal and a vision which may be realized by the humblest child. We pray Thee for a season of renewal by widening our range of affection, by the amplitude of service which we can enlarge in unity with every good and needful work. We beseech Thee to give strength of body, minds of deep conviction and courageous spirits to the Congress and to the highest tribunal of our Republic.

Heavenly Father, help us to discern the full pattern of human life and happiness. There are social ills to be overthrown, economic conditions which breed poverty, the curse of alcohol and wrongs which come from tenement districts; these evils are vast with peril to our destiny. Inspire our great land with the

Christway of service; deliver us from the misfortunes and the sufferings caused by selfish men who would despoil it of its true worth and dignity. Dear Lord, enrich our souls and fill them with rich treasures which overflow to lift and bless other lands. Whether our gifts be large or small, enable us to build them into God and man; all things else whatsoever shall fail and go. We pray Thee to shield us from the tragedy of the talent which was wrapped in distrust, selfishness, and, at last, failure. In the name of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 30, 1943, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 21, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as chairman of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 313), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CLAIR ENGLE, of the State of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Mines and Mining and World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall introduce a public-health bill.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize a reorganization of the unwieldy administrative structure of the Public Health Service. Hearings were held on S. 400 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and that committee reported the bill favorably with certain amendments. The bill, as amended, passed the Senate unanimously. Even before the introduction of H. R. 649, the need for a reorganization of the Public Health Service had been the subject of study by your committee. As a result of the study which the committee has given this matter and the hearings which have been held on this bill the committee is convinced that only a thorough-going codification and revision of all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service will accomplish the purposes of H. R. 649 and S. 400.

In order to understand why such a revision and codification is necessary, there must be considered the process by which the Public Health Service has evolved by succession of laws from a small corps of doctors authorized in 1789 to give medical and hospital relief to American seamen of the merchant marine to its present position as the central health organization of the Federal Government with many functions and major responsibilities vital to the welfare and safety of the Nation, both in war and peace.

It is evident that the Public Health Service has grown by gradual accretion of functions and divisions. The laws establishing these functions and divisions generally were passed one at a time and often without any attempt to fit the added functions and divisions into the pattern which had previously been established. For these reasons there not only is an unwieldy and inconsistent administrative structure, but there are also many obsolete, inconsistent and overlapping provisions of law pertaining to the functions of the Public Health Service.

The bill is designed to bring together in one enactment all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service, to permit the administrative reorganization authorized by H. R. 649 and S. 400, to adjust the wartime status of the commissioned corps of the service, to reconcile the conflicts and eliminate the overlapping in the law, and to make certain mechanical revisions found necessary by long administrative experience.

While the bill is not strictly a codification, it is in no sense a measure designed to place the Public Health Service into new fields of operation or to enlarge its functions and powers. Its sole purpose is to enable the Public Health Service to perform its present statutory functions more effectively.

PVT. HELEN F. VAN COUTREN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I read an article that appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times, September 30:

TEN IN ST. LOUIS FAMILY SERVE IN ARMED FORCES

Pvt. Helen F. Van Coutren started her basic training as a WAC at Ft. Des Moines, Iowa, yesterday and thus became the tenth child of Mr. and Mrs. L. M. Van Coutren of 1292 Hamilton Boulevard, to serve in the present war.

Her two sisters are WAC's, Pvt. Adine Van Coutren serving in Africa, and Pvt. Rita Van Coutren, stationed at Washington.

One brother, Thomas, is a sergeant in the Army, and six other brothers are in the Navy.

I congratulate this family on the great contribution it is making in the present emergency. It is a record that is seldom equaled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement by Roy Miller, vice

president, Navy League of the United States and State chairman for Navy Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record some observations made by me on the meat and sugar-beet situation in Montana and also on the situation in which the copper miners find themselves in that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter from Mr. Hugh Smith, Philadelphia Better Business Bureau, and an address given by Mr. Smith at Cincinnati, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on three separate subjects, and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered,

I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 50 minutes on the dairy situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Boston Daily Record of Monday, September 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, as given at the public meeting in connection with the fifteenth annual scientific assembly of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia in Washington, D. C., on October 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Bill Cunningham that appeared in the Boston Herald of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article written by the Governor of South Dakota and appearing in the South Dakota Highway magazine; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in three respects, one concerning the cot-

ton farmer and another concerning a subject discussed in three letters written by me which I shall include in my remarks, and in the third to include an article by Mr. Edgar L. Morphet, of the Florida State Department of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of socialized medicine, and further to extend my remarks on the question of the subsidy roll-back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in yesterday's New York Times, by James B. Reston, who writes from London. The article is entitled "Russia Poses First Great Crisis of the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA VEERING TO THE RIGHT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is gratifying to me, because I pointed out many months ago that Russia was veering to the right and that within a short space of time would demonstrate to the world that its aims are democratic and that justice will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I was highly gratified to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call to the attention of the House and the country the unbiased report on Russia by Captain Rickenbacker.

I have known the captain favorably for many years and still hold him in high esteem notwithstanding his unfavorable criticism of organized labor, but that was as an officer of one of the large air-transport companies. However, the report which he makes on Russia, to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] calls attention and is inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is really an official report to and in the interest of our country.

I believe that every fair-minded American whose mind has not been poisoned by Nazi-Fascist propaganda against Soviet Russia will concede that Captain Rickenbacker's report and account of his interviews are based on facts and truths.

Nearly 2 years ago and before Hitler attacked Russia I stated on the floor that Russia in order to gain time was forced into making a treaty with Germany. Notwithstanding strong opposition in this country that action did not cause us to discontinue the shipping to Russia of machinery, tools, implements, and other war materials which they purchased and paid for with moneys deposited in our banks in advance.

While the Nazi propagandists were endeavoring to induce us to forget and divert our attention from the wholesale massacres of all those who failed to agree or follow Hitler's murderous aims, they were charging that Stalin had ordered the elimination of many Russian officers and had closed all churches, denying the people the right of worship. The Nazi propagandists did not state, however, that, unlike the murderous action of Hitler in the cases of certain German officers, civilians, peoples and officials of invaded countries, in his wholesale purges, the so-called Russian officers who were executed received a fair and open trial by Stalin, and that it was upon confessions and evidence that clearly showed they were on the pay roll of the Japanese and Nazis and had sought to undermine Russia that they were convicted and the deserved punishment meted out to them. I obtained a complete report at that time which indicated clearly that all Russia was seeking to accomplish was to separate the church from the state and was not opposed to free worship.

While President Roosevelt stated at that time that he had been assured there would be complete freedom of worship he was being continuously assailed and attacked by the Nazi propagandists and even by our own American pacifists and appeasers, and this notwithstanding that Russia had adopted a real constitution granting freedom and liberty to its people and eliminating many of Lenin's original policies. Russia was gradually and continuously veering to the right, and therefore I am pleased that since then the statements of the President have been justified. I recall stating that Communists promised a great deal—just as the Republican and Democratic platforms usually do, though the makers realized that all the pledges could not be fully carried out.

The statements of Captain Rickenbacker and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are timely and should put a stop to the activities of those few

Nazi ideologists and even those few misguided Communists in our country.

I congratulate Russia upon its great achievements and upon its continuous liberalizing of its policies affecting the welfare of its people. I believe when history is written that Russia will receive the recognition and credit to which it is entitled for having rendered to humanity, at such terrific cost, a service not only to its own people and country but to the democracies of the world.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 3018) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill gives the Secretary of the Interior unlimited authority to dispose of any properties on lands under his jurisdiction, even though that disposal may not be authorized by law—a jurisdiction entirely too great to be passed by unanimous consent. Therefore, I object, Mr. Speaker.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 340, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is on the floor and I would like to ask him to give a short explanation of this legislation.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, a strip of land for street purposes. The street will probably be about 6 feet wide, to the best of my knowledge and information.

Years ago all of the land involved belonged to the United States Government and it was used for an Army barracks. Then by act of Congress the land was conveyed to the Territory of Alaska with the understanding that it was to be used

as a home for aged pioneers. The Territorial Government spent about \$300,000 in putting up buildings as a home for the aged pioneers on the tract. Recently the population of the city of Sitka has increased and there is considerably more traffic on the streets now than there was years ago. In rehabilitating this street it was found desirable to widen it by about 6 feet, as I recall, at one point where the tract of the Pioneers' Home bulges out into the street, so to speak. It is desired to take a little part of this tract and use it for a street. The land desired for street purposes is not occupied by anything except as a lawn. That lawn could be narrowed and the people benefitted by the passage of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. PRIEST. In the event the city at any time in the future ceases to use this land for street purposes would the title revert to the Government?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. It is so provided in the original bill and so provided by amendment in the bill now before us.

Mr. RANKIN. The streets of Sitka are very, very narrow, are they not?

Mr. DIMOND. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Washington, our distinguished colleague of a few years ago, Hon. John F. Miller, who has now passed away, said that when Sitka was the capital of Alaska it was the only capital in the world that never had a horse in it, because the streets were so narrow they could not use them. So, Mr. Speaker, with all the territory we have in Alaska, comprising about 590,000 square miles, it seems to me we can very well afford to grant to the city of Sitka the few feet of ground necessary to make these streets passable. I hope there will be no objection of the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska is hereby authorized to grant and convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes, such portions of the lands conveyed to the Territory of Alaska by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502), as may be necessary or desirable for such purposes, without regard to reversionary provisions in section 2 of said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, following the comma, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following:

"and not conveyed to the Sitka Cold Storage Co., by the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 652), as the city of Sitka shall designate are necessary or desirable for street purposes. Any conveyance made under this act shall be without regard to the reversionary provisions in section 2 of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502).

"All oil, coal, or other materials in land designated and conveyed to the city of Sitka under this act, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same shall be reserved to the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The city of Sitka shall never sell or otherwise dispose of any part of the prop-

erty conveyed to it pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of this act; and if the same shall ever be abandoned for the uses herein declared the said premises shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING A REASONABLE DEFINITION AND STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 149, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), dry milk solids or defatted milk solids is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk," when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Line 5, before "dry", insert "nonfat."

Line 9, after "centum", insert "by weight of."

Line 10, after "centum", insert "by weight."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids."

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that application has been made for a rule to consider this bill in Committee of the Whole and I think that would be the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I did submit an application for a rule and after I submitted my application for the rule, I thought that the matter had been satisfactorily adjusted by conference with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Dr. Gabrielson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have accumulated a little file on this matter and it develops ever-increasing interest

as I go along, and for that reason I think an authorization for the expenditure of \$290,000 and the setting up of 30 additional spots with their pay rolls is a matter which might become permanent as we go along and I think is deserving of some debate in the Committee of the Whole. I would much prefer to have the gentleman procure a rule, for I think that is the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the matter is so important and the explanation that has been given so clear that I cannot agree; I will have to agree, of course, if objection is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to press my objection, but I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I think it ought to be considered in the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BLAND. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my objection.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as is indicated by the title to the bill, this would give the Secretary of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

There can be no question but what the duties of the Secretary of the Interior have increased tremendously in the last few years, but I do not think that this burden has increased in proportion any more than the duties of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, each one of whom has the same number as the Secretary of the Interior now has. Therefore, I object.

MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 378, to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the acquisition of a small area of added land to one of our national monuments. The Secretary of the Interior has not recommended the bill, and ordinarily we on this committee would insist that the matter be brought up under a general rule rather than by unanimous consent. However, in view of the fact that the bill is sponsored by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and in view of the fact that the bill contemplates the expenditure of \$25,000, we have decided to forego our principle and practice and to raise no objection at this time. However, we will offer an amend-

ment to limit the appropriation authorized to \$25,000.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to acquire, in his discretion, certain lands located in the State of Arizona known as the Montezuma Well property, containing approximately 180 acres and situated within section 36, township 15 north, range 5 east, and section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian. Such lands, when acquired, shall become a detached unit of Montezuma Castle National Monument.

(b) Effective on the date of the acquisition of such property, the south half of the north-west quarter of section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, containing 80 acres of land owned by the United States, shall also become a part of such national monument.

Sec. 2. All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national monument shall be applicable with respect to the lands described in the first section of this act upon the addition of such lands to such national monument. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York:

On page 2, line 16, after the words "as may be necessary", insert a comma and the words and figures "but not to exceed \$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3029, to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following report is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

Illinois River, Ill.; in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 711, Seventy-seventh Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot see the

justice of this bill if we ever expect to do justice to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. While the real Jeffersonian Democrats of America seem to have been asleep, this commission for the alleged anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson erected the most hideous monstrosity with which the memory of a great man has ever been punished in all the tide of time—this so-called Jefferson Memorial down here.

They picked out of the sayings of Thomas Jefferson certain statements, threw them together, mixed them into a conglomeration that makes Thomas Jefferson look like a Communist, just as far from the Jeffersonian philosophy of government as could possibly be. Now, if we are going to do anything else for Thomas Jefferson, for goodness' sake, as a great Englishman once said: "Let's don't add another pang to his death." Let us get somebody besides this group that perpetrated this outrage on the memory of Thomas Jefferson by putting those inscriptions inside the so-called Jefferson Memorial. I invite all decent Americans to go in there and read them, and get the life of Jefferson, get his own words, his own sayings, and then compare them.

Then they will recognize the hideous attempt to distort history by this Commission. Why not put in there the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson as expressed in his first inaugural address, the 16 points which he announced to the world and to posterity which constitute the sum of good government.

I will read from that address, and will take the liberty of numbering those 16 points and set them out by paragraphs. In that, the most historic address of the nineteenth century, Mr. Jefferson said:

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations.

He then laid down the following 16 points:

First:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political.

Second:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Third:

The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Fourth:

The preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

Fifth:

A jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the

revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided.

Sixth:

Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics from which there is no appeal but to force—the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism.

Seventh:

A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war till regulars may relieve them.

Eighth:

The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

Ninth:

Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened.

Tenth:

The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith.

Eleventh:

Encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid.

Twelfth:

The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason.

Thirteenth:

Freedom of religion.

Fourteenth:

Freedom of the press.

Fifteenth:

Freedom of person under the protection of habeas corpus.

Sixteenth:

Trial by juries impartially selected. These principles—

He says—

from the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of terror or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Why was that not inscribed on the interior of this alleged Jefferson Memorial just as the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln was placed inside the Lincoln Memorial? Why all this conglomeration, why all this distortion of the words of Jefferson? Why all this changing and mixing of phrases and the elimination of statements in order to misrepresent to the children of the coming generations the greatest democratic statesman the world has ever seen?

No; I am not going to agree for this commission—which left these immortal expressions of Jefferson out of the inscriptions on the walls of that memorial—I am not going to agree for that commission to put its hands on the record of Thomas Jefferson again.

I object to this bill in its present form. The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

DAM AND DIKE IN THE NORTH SLOUGH, COOS COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3145, authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, and to the North Slough drainage district, organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oregon, in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian.

Work shall not be commenced on such dam and dike until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam and dike hereby authorized is not commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of the passage of this act. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 9 of the act approved August 26, 1937 (heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and September 22, 1941), authorizing the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, the North Slough drainage district, and the North Slough dike district, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian, be and is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this authority shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the dam and dike herein referred to be commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of approval hereof.

"Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved August 26, 1937."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes in reply to the statements by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall want 5 minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair reminds the gentlemen that there are other special orders which have already been agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of the Consent Calendar. FLAG FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO DIE IN THE SERVICE OF THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States and agree to its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor, having reserved the right to object.

Mr. BLAND. I have reserved the right to object in order to get an opportunity to speak on the Jefferson bill, to which I think every American is entitled.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a very wide range under a reservation of objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many things about the Jefferson Memorial I did not know about, there are many things that have been done that I do not know anything about and I am not in accord with all that has been done. They may have been right.

But this has nothing to do with this United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, except that it is created, and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will separate it from this Commission that perpetrated this alleged Jefferson Memorial down here and placed those misleading inscriptions inside it, I shall not object. Jefferson was the greatest promoter of agricultural development of his day and generation. I recognize that fact, and I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. In order that this matter may be understood, this calls for the creation of the National Agricultural Bicentenary Committee for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth and deals with agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but it is under the supervision of that Commission. It says: "A joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson," and so forth. Whoever collected, composed, or compiled those statements inside the Jefferson Me-

morial would not know a cottonstalk from a cocklebur or a buckhead from a clevis. What do they know about agriculture?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Virginia will separate it from this Commission and let it be conducted by some real Jeffersonians, Democrats or Republicans, or both, I shall not object, but I am not going to even run the risk of having this crowd distort the record of Thomas Jefferson on agriculture, about which they know nothing. Whoever got up those inscriptions inside that Jefferson Memorial knows absolutely nothing about agriculture.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to restore the bill, S. J. Res. 47, to the calendar and that it may be passed over without objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to that.

Mr. BLAND. I may say that I am a new member of that committee, and it was brought in for the first time for consideration recently. The chairman is not here, and it occurs to me that we can best meet the objections of the gentleman by having it passed over.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman agree that it go over without prejudice?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; that is what I am asking.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has three pages of whereases. It does not seem to me that it is good practice to write that kind of a bill.

Mr. BLAND. I had some question about that myself when I read those whereases but they seemed to be all right. That will be considered, of course, and the other objections will be considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Do those whereases distort the record of Thomas Jefferson as badly as the inscriptions down here in the Jefferson Memorial?

Mr. BLAND. I have no idea that they do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know anything about this bill. We have had the Consent Calendar under consideration and the gentleman now asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill that has not been on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey and to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the situation is simply this: The bill provides a flag for those soldiers and sailors whose bodies have not been recovered. Under the law, the War Department or the Navy Department when

they send a soldier's body home send a flag with it. But there are a great many of these boys unfortunately whose bodies are not recovered and this measure authorizes the Veterans' Administration to supply those flags.

Mr. KEAN. They are given to the families?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they are given to the families. I took this up with the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and they are unanimously for it.

Mr. KEAN. I cannot possibly object to such a bill as this but I want to give notice that when we have the Consent Calendar up for consideration, the bills should be on the Consent Calendar and in the future I am going to object.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that if I had not been thoroughly convinced that no Member of the House would object I would not have called the bill up.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Mississippi follow the practice of the House which has been announced by the majority and minority leaders and which is generally adhered to, that no bills shall be permitted to come up for consideration until the gentleman expecting to call the bill up has at least conferred with the majority leader?

Mr. RANKIN. I conferred with the Speaker. I also conferred with the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. This is just one of those things, a type of bill that no one feels like objecting to. However, the practice is such that it would be ruinous if this general philosophy were followed in calling up bills. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], has stated on the floor time and time again, that this practice will not be indulged in. I am just wondering if he was advised that this bill was to be called up in this matter.

Mr. McCormack. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. I had no knowledge of the bill coming up.

I heard the colloquy. It is usually good practice, as well as courtesy, to consult the leadership on both sides. It is bad practice not to do so. I would suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he bring this bill up tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I conferred with the Speaker about this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has made the statement from this Chair many times that, after conference with him, any Member intending to take up a matter out of order should confer with both the majority and minority leaders. The gentleman from Mississippi did speak to the Chair about this matter. Not knowing whether or not the gentleman had conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and without questioning him on it this morning, the Chair recognized him. Under the circumstances, the Chair would suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his request.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I shall ask permission to call up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCormack. That is what I suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPOSED FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL BANK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to make some observations on proposals for the formation of some kind of a world bank or international financial organization after the war. In this first place I want to say that nothing ought to be done about this matter until the fullest discussion has been had in the Congress.

An international clearing house to facilitate the settlement of balances as between the nations of the world, to be helpful in assisting nations in balancing their exports against their imports and to put international trade on perhaps a more orderly basis than it has been in the past, would be altogether desirable. There are, however, certain dangers in connection with such a proposal that I want to point out, because it appears to me that if any such world bank were to be given the power to dictate to nations as to what policies they must pursue with regard to their domestic money, it would be exercising a power which will prove dangerous both to international peace and to the expansion of production within the nations.

Some of the proposals for a world bank certainly are open to this objection. What could happen under these circumstances is briefly this: It would be possible for the board or controlling agency of such a world bank to say to a certain nation, "We are sorry, but we cannot continue to accommodate you unless you maintain a certain reserve in such and such a precious metal or unless you reduce the volume of your currency," or "We will take these measures which you request if you do pursue a certain policy with regard to the volume of money in circulation in your nation."

This could mean virtually an economic dictatorship in the hands of such a world bank over the economies of the various nations — particularly the financially weaker ones.

I also want to point out that when we talk about tying the currency of one nation to the currency of another nation we seldom, I think, remember that it does not do the least bit of good to tie the value of the dollar, for example, to the pound, or to tie the pound to the dollar, unless the domestic buying powers of both the pound and the dollar have within the British Nation and the American Nation themselves been stabilized. Otherwise the proposition amounts to something like tying a couple of balloons together in the vain hope that you will thereby stabilize the flight of one or the other.

So the fundamental problem that we confront is the problem of securing a stabilization of the purchasing power of money within each nation, and on the

basis of that it becomes possible then to work toward an international stabilization which will be effective.

I do believe, of course, that the granting of credit and the making of loans to certain nations after the war will probably be necessary. I think that if that can be done through some international agency it might be well, provided always, however, that they are not made the means of controlling the domestic economic life of the nations to whom they are made. That is the warning I wanted to sound.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is the gentleman approaching the suggestion of means whereby stabilization may be effected as to the economies within the respective countries?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I believe it can be done. I have believed it for years. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. It is something about which I have spoken on the floor a good many times, and about which I have written some.

I think it is altogether possible for us to have a scientific monetary system whereby our monetary supply will be expanded in proportion to the expansion of the production of real goods and services, and whereby inflation can be prevented by judicious use of the taxing power. I think with two weapons in the hands of a monetary authority set up by this Congress, namely, first, the exclusive right to create money in this Nation; and, second, the right to recommend to Congress tax measures which would be effective in curbing inflation, you can get a stabilization of the buying power of your money. I think that especially with regard to agriculture there is nothing quite so important from the standpoint of future prosperity.

I want to say a word on another subject if I have time.

We have heard a great deal of opposition expressed to the use of subsidies to keep down the price of farm commodities and food products. I want to say frankly, I think it is true that if we attempt to subsidize the entire Nation to reduce the cost of food to all American citizens by means of the payment of some type of subsidy, we are attempting to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps, and it will not be a counter-inflationary measure, but quite the contrary.

It seems to me there are two problems that we have to confront. One is the problem of having an adequate return to farm producers so as to induce maximum production. Certainly the price that they receive is an important element therein. The second thing is that there are certain people in this Nation to whom the Congress owes a very real and profound obligation, from the standpoint of protecting the buying power of their money. The people that I refer to are, first and most important perhaps, the dependents of men who are now serving the armed forces. We

have passed legislation, inadequate though it be in my judgment, providing a certain number of dollars to the wives and children of men now in the service. We certainly have an obligation to see that the buying power of those dollars is not constantly reduced. We have an obligation not to dilute the buying power of the compensations and pensions being received by war veterans of this country. We have an obligation with regard to every single person who is attempting to get along on an old age pension in the various States.

In addition to that, there are some 21 percent of our population today whose annual earnings are \$1,000 a year or less. It does not seem to me therefore that it is an adequate position for a Member to take, nor one that he can consistently defend, to simply say, "I am against all subsidies," and let it go at that. I think there has to be another answer to this problem. My own feeling about this question would be quite different and much more hopeful if we had established what I have chosen to call "the converse of rationing."

A rationing program was instituted for the purpose of seeing that nobody in the population has more than his share of the supply of scarce commodities, but I believe that in time of war it becomes important that we see to it that a minimum basic standard of living is possible for all our people. I do not believe that by policies that have to be pursued for the sake of securing adequate production for the war, we should deliberately permit a 25-percent reduction to take place in the amount of food that can be bought by some of the groups of people whose income is low and whom I enumerated a moment ago. It therefore seems to me that the right way to use a program of governmental support, if you have to do it, is to spend that money where it is really needed and where it will really do the good and reach the need that exists. We have already had experience with the operation of the stamp plan. We used it before for the purpose of making it possible for farm commodities which we called surpluses—when really they were not from any real, human point of view—but we called them surpluses to enable them to be moved to the people who needed additional food.

The answer to this obligation that I said I believed was ours could be found by means of instituting what has been called in a bill which was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and in the House by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] and myself a national food-allotment plan. Briefly, under this plan, when people whose family income is less than an amount which would enable them to purchase a minimum food-allotment diet as described in this legislation went to their ration board to get their regular ration stamps, they would be able to obtain some supplementary stamps with which they could increase their purchasing power of food, in order to bring up their buying power for food to this minimum national food allotment which is herein described. Under those circumstances, we would

then have protected all of our people, especially the groups I mentioned, against the possibility that where an increase in the price of a farm crop was absolutely necessary in order to cover the cost of production, those people, where it would really hurt them and where they would get less food than they needed, could still be protected and get the food that they needed.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Would that not solve the problem which is now before us, where a certain amount of money is necessary to subsidize the production of butter? We increase the points and thereby prevent them from having it anyway.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is a very pertinent observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does your bill assume that there is plenty and that the difficulty lies in the lack of purchasing ability?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, it does not quite assume that there is plenty. I think there are a great many food products where, relative to the present existing demand, there is a real shortage. I do not think we can avoid that. I think that is going to be with us. But I am saying that as to these people who are in a position where their incomes have not been increased at all since the war began, or where they are attempting to get along on these dependency allowances that we provided, or where they are attempting to go along on compensation for disabilities created in previous wars, or where old folks are trying to get along on their old-age pensions, or where there are certain groups of school teachers, white-collar workers, and a good many wage-earners who do not have enough to buy the food they actually need, it seems to me that the minimum necessary to sustain real health and welfare ought to be secured to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming that I have 54 cents and I want to buy a pound of butter, I can now only get a quarter of a pound of butter. What are we going to do when there is not enough butter in the country and the Government is purchasing too much of it? That is what we are getting so many kicks about. What are we going to do when we have such a tremendous shortage of production?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not saying that my bill is going to solve the whole problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is not the whole purpose of the bill. But I want to be free to do everything within my power to increase production of agricultural commodities.

Sometimes I think an increase in the price is necessary and important in or-

der to do that, but I think it is important likewise for the Congress to be in position where it can say that it is not permitting such price increases to take from any American family the food it needs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman considered the great advisability, to my mind, of having different ration points for butter than for meat? It seems rather illogical to me that we should have to use the same points for butter that we use for meat.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry I do not feel I am competent to answer that question. If my wife were present I am sure she could give the lady from Massachusetts an intelligent answer on that question, but I do not think I should attempt to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know that the gentleman goes into everything very thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand and I think I see what the gentleman from Massachusetts has in mind. I suppose, however, it is important to keep these things as simple as they can be, and it is complicated at best. That is the only thing I can think of that arises on the other side of the picture, but I will say to the gentleman that I am inclined to agree with her about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. He is always very fair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understand correctly, it takes about 4 years to get a milk producer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that be correct, is not one of the reasons for this great shortage the fact that we have been killing off our milk cows, getting rid of them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think we must prevent the slaughtering of any good milk cows whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we will not have butter until that shortage has been met?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason goes beyond that; it is the result of a vast increase in the demands for these products, the tremendous increase in the demands for butter; the fact that the American people are consuming vastly more dairy products than they ever did before, together with the demands for our armed services, all this adds up to a far greater increase in demand than our farmers have had to meet ever before, together with the fact that we also have a responsibility to certain people across the water which we did not have before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the fundamental reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do not want any policy to be pursued that is going to cut down the supply or result in a de-

crease of production; we have got this responsibility to meet, and I want to preserve every ounce of production possible. I do not want these dairy cows to be taken out of production; I want to stimulate production under present circumstances. I want to have a price policy that will guarantee maximum production, but when I advocate that I do not want to be in position where I can really be charged with having reduced the buying power of some groups of our people below the minimum required to provide a decent living for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by General O'Connor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRISONS A SOURCE OF MANPOWER FOR THE ARMY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of agitation in the country about the drafting of fathers into the armed forces. I am one of the men who has voted for every dollar the Army and the Navy have asked for, and I would be the last man who would do one thing to hinder the armed forces, because if there is one problem ahead of all others it is to win this war. I am willing to give them just as many men as they need, regardless of where they come from or how badly it hurts; but, after all, there seems to be a question in the minds of a lot of people as to the necessity of some of the things that are being done.

The question has arisen as to why so many men in penal institutions are not used, why all of those men do not find their way into the war effort. Because of that I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 3202, which provides that before any fathers are inducted into the armed forces, all able-bodied, sound-minded men in the penal institutions should be used in the war effort wherever they might fit. For just a short while today I want to talk about this problem and call to the attention of the House the reaction I have had dealing with this subject.

There is no reason exactly that I can see why the armed forces should not take a lot of men that society must ultimately take. It is true that after a man has served his time the Army takes him. The man serving his time is no worse than the man who has served his time; and those of us who have done the same things but did not get caught are no better than they are. So I cannot see any good reason why sound-minded, able-bodied men should not be used in the armed forces. It simmers down to this: All these men except the lifers in these prisons eventually serve their time or are

paroled regardless of whether they are sound in mind and body or not. Society has got to take even the feeble-minded ones. I do not see why society should have to take a group of men that the Army refuses to take. If there is one place where they can be disciplined, it is in the Army.

I call your attention to certain facts and information which I shall read from an editorial in a publication known as The New Era published at the Leavenworth Federal Prison, Leavenworth, Kans. I quote from the editorial:

Every day and every night the hundreds of radio programs of the Nation repeat one message, over and over, "Forget sectional and personal differences! Banish every custom or prejudice which might hold back the fullest war effort. Let nothing prevent the utilization of every available man, every talent, every skill, every dollar."

And yet, strange as it seems, 200,000 able men, American men, many of them skilled at manning these, or similar, farms and machines, plead for a chance at these jobs now, today—reaching out toward this chance of redemption and their chance of helping America, as a man dying of thirst reaches out toward a water mirage in an agony of hope and in an agony of mentally fighting against the black despair of being held back now—now of all times.

Hundreds of articles have appeared in magazines and recent publications attesting to the patriotic men in institutions. They get very little money for what they do, and yet in every penal institution in the country they are asked to and do buy War bonds. For instance, the inmates of Leavenworth Penitentiary purchased War bonds totaling \$86,025, and they do not get as much per day for their labor as many of us Congressmen spend a day for cigars. Money is donated to service organizations totaling \$3,034.98. One thousand four hundred of the inmates of Leavenworth donated 1,335 pints of blood. Certainly this attests to the patriotic nature of these men. They are not lying down on the job. I quote further:

In proportion to their income, which is barely adequate to supply them with the simplest luxuries such as cigarettes, these prisoners have contributed financially to the war effort through the purchase of bonds to a degree that should shame the civilian. Their record as voluntary blood donors to the Red Cross is a nationally known example of patriotism. The record of the prisoners already accepted into the armed forces is literal and undeniable proof of their Americanism.

All of these agencies have pointed out the fact that these prisoners are going to be released at some future date anyway and have asked "Why not now when conditions for their reform are best and when the Nation's need of their services is greatest?"

The Federal penal rules governing the release of prisoners did not contemplate that America might be drawn into a great war. These rules were made to fit a peacetime economy in which men competed for jobs.

These rules, as they now stand, preclude the release of a prisoner until he has served a certain number of years of his sentence, no matter whether the prisoner is rehabilitated or not.

However much training or skill the man may have acquired, however completely the classification board of the penal institution may have determined that the prisoner is

ready and safe for reentry into society, under these rules he cannot be released until his minimum time, be it 2 or 20 years, has been served.

He goes on in another article written in the Rocky Mountain News to say:

I am in hearty agreement with Lewis E. Lawes, former warden of Sing Sing, in his recommendation that at least 75 percent of the men in America's prisons should be released to fight.

Mr. Lawes says he sometimes thinks there is more patriotism and spirit inside the prisons than outside. Whenever blood donors are asked to volunteer, for example, scores of men in prison step forward. "Just give them a chance to fight for their country, and then get out of the way," he advised.

And that's sound advice.

On my last visit to the State penitentiary with Governor Carr, I found ample proof of the patriotic spirit mentioned by Mr. Lawes.

There has been some effort made to release prisoners and some have gotten into the armed forces and have very good records.

In New Jersey some 400 prisoners have been paroled to go into the service and have been transformed into real fighting men. Only a handful have proved unsuited for military life, none have committed serious infractions, and many have records of conspicuous merit.

It is stated further here that—

The Federal Government is also exploring the possibility of utilizing manpower bottled up in Federal penitentiaries.

Why should the Federal Government be exploring that? The President has authority to order your son or my son or you or I into the service. Why should not the President issue a proclamation that these men of sound mind and able bodies be used in the armed forces where they can serve?

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Bureau of Prisons under the direction of James Bennett is exploring this matter, that prisoners from our Federal prisons have gone into the armed service, that this exploration to which the gentleman refers is already under way and has been for a long, long time? Does the gentleman's bill provide for the release of all prisoners to go into the armed service?

Mr. GROSS. It provides that those of sound mind and able body up to the age of 45 may be taken into the service.

Mr. STEFAN. Do they have to pass an examination under a psychiatrist or a doctor?

Mr. GROSS. "Sound mind," of course, would imply that.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the only qualification, just sound mind?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. It is a fact that prisoners have been released who have had sound minds and they have committed terrible crimes upon society through the parole system sometimes. The parole system itself is being explored. I may say to the gentleman that I happen to be a member of the Committee on Ap-

appropriations that makes the appropriations for Federal prisons.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will find some very illuminating information if he will refer to the proceedings of that committee.

Mr. GROSS. The fact is that the red tape connected with it has kept men back and that what it needs is streamlining. This matter of exploring, exploring and investigating in an emergency is one of the things that the country is sick and tired of.

It is stated here further:

Those favoring release of inmates for war effort point out that 96 percent of them will come out eventually. Now, they contend, is the ideal time, as there is plenty to keep them occupied.

That is taken from the Christian Science Monitor of April 6, 1943.

Now, I want to call attention to some reaction I have received. I have here a communication signed by Dutton S. Peterson, of the joint legislative committee of the State of New York, to study the use of New York State prisoners in war service. That committee has made a study of this and here is what he writes:

Your proposal that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45 and physically fit are inducted is interesting.

I feel confident that some type of Federal legislation might help the situation. Of course various Federal agencies are working at the problem with varying results in different States.

The recently established special selective-service panels in the prisons are making little progress, in fact seem to be retarding Army inductions. I have reports from many States relative to this difficulty.

In their report they go on to say:

1. Within a radius of 50 miles of Elmira Reformatory an estimated 25-30 percent of hay is still standing in the fields unharvested due to lack of help.

2. Within one-half mile of Elmira Reformatory the Elmira Foundry Co., a General Electric affiliate, engaged wholly in war production of the most critical kind, is seriously hampered by lack of common laborers. Delivery of orders is delayed and additional orders refused because of this shortage of unskilled labor. Twenty men working in the yard would speed the work of hundreds in the production of critical war material.

Certainly there is a place where a lot of these men could be used. They go on to say that induction is slow and cumbersome and needs streamlining.

Let me quote some of the things I have clipped from newspapers recently in connection with this problem. Just a week or so ago there appeared an Associated Press report, reading like this:

Prisoners at Western State Penitentiary heard themselves praised yesterday by Lewis E. Lawes, former warden at Sing Sing, for their outstanding service to the Nation through production for the war effort.

More than 1,000 inmates gathered on the prison athletic field and saw a Navy color guard run up a production pennant within the walled areas. They had earned it by fulfilling Navy, Army, and Coast Guard con-

tracts in the prison's metalworking and textile shops.

Warden S. P. Ashe announced that the prisoners had bought \$12,455.75 worth of War bonds in the Third War Loan, almost quadrupling their quota of \$3,378.

May I say that I am mighty happy to report that while some judges throughout the country have not expressed themselves about this thing, certain other judges are in a great many cases giving men suspended sentences if they will present themselves for induction. In my county—York County—Judge Sherwood and Judge Anderson have recently suspended the sentences in the case of nine men if they would promise to present themselves for induction into the armed service. Seven of them have passed the examination and are now in the armed forces. Evidently this thing is taking hold throughout the country and the judges are going to get as many men into the armed forces as they can in preference to seeing them go to prison.

It is a fact that some fellows have simply committed a trivial offense and they could thereby escape getting into the armed forces. I have before me an Associated Press report where a man over at Philadelphia, who has a very excellent record in the marines, is now on probation and consequently cannot get into the armed forces. The thing he was charged with was slapping a nurse on the back at Jefferson Hospital in Philadelphia. He said he did it as a joke; he thought it was a lot of fun; but they picked him up, took him before an alderman, who gave him a suspended sentence. Here is a good, old-time marine who will not be taken by the marines, the Army, or Navy because he slapped a nurse on the back.

It is too ridiculous for us to talk about when you are thinking about taking a man with half a dozen children and putting him in the armed forces, when the Army will not take a man because he slapped a nurse on the back to give her a laugh.

We can go on down the line and mention numerous cases. Let me call your attention to some of the response that has come from people around the country. For instance, here is a letter from California. It states:

This is just to tell you that I believe that your bill providing that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45, and physically fit, have been drafted, is a good thing, and I surely trust that it will go through.

Then I have a letter here signed by Neil S. Bishop, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Maine Legislature. He is heartily in support of this movement. He says:

More power to you.

He goes on to say that he has for a long time been hoping that something along this line would be done. This only goes to show that men in public life are thinking about it.

You may wonder what the prisoners think about it. I have here a letter from a prisoner, inmate 16790, by the name of John B. Suttle, in the Oregon State

Prison, in which he says that he has given his blood right along, he has bought his bonds, and he is willing to serve in the armed forces any place that he can serve.

I have a number of other letters. Here is one from the Illinois State Penitentiary, from Convict Warren Wilcoxon, register No. 16023. He says:

I have pleaded and demanded a chance to show my Americanism and my willingness, yes, eagerness to fight for the land that my forefathers fought and died for. Am I to be deprived of this chance because I have violated one of man-made laws? Who, if not I and my kind, are more capable of slinking through the jungles taking pot shots at the ones that have become so egotistical that they think they can invade our soil?

I am writing you this to tell you you have not the slightest idea of the feelings of a con toward all isms but one, Americanism.

He goes on to say that all he wants is an opportunity.

Here is another one signed by Henry Shepperd, register No. 16998, from the Illinois State Penitentiary, which has just about the same story, pleading for an opportunity to fight and to prove himself.

I have here another one from Elmer Whited, register No. 17852, in which he pleads for an opportunity to fight for God's country and to reinstate himself.

I have two other letters from inmates of the Illinois State Penitentiary similarly pleading for an opportunity.

Here are some cards I have received. These are all written in good handwriting, better than the average man writes. These are from the Kentucky State Prison. This man's name is Finley Duncan, convict No. 35173. He says that he is 30 years of age and would like to get into the armed forces and serve his country.

I have another one here from a young man who says:

I am 32 years old. That is a fine bill and we all would like to do our part in the armed forces.

Here is another card from the La Grange Penitentiary. He says:

I am a prisoner in this institution, serving an 8-year sentence for robbery. I possess a clean past record, and I am fully qualified to serve these United States as only a true American can. I am 25 years old.

Can you imagine a man who has committed one crime of larceny being in the pen for 8 years at a time like this, when maybe just when the war is over he will have served his 8 years, so that when he goes out society will have to take him; yet today the Army refuses to take him? After all, whether or not they make good soldiers, if they cannot be handled in the Army where will they ever be handled?

Here is another card from a convict named Clarence B. Young, No. 29799. He says:

I have just read in the paper your opinion on drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. I think it is a good idea to draft all convicts that are able-bodied. We will be watching the outcome of your bill and hoping that we will have a chance to help lick the enemy.

These are written in good handwriting, better than half of us Congressmen write.

Here is another one from the penitentiary signed by Manon Dixon, convict No. 33342. He says:

I would appreciate the opportunity to help win this war.

So it goes on. I have a lot more mail in the office. I am not pleading to keep fathers home if we need them, but to give these men an opportunity. The prisons are overcrowded. They are more of a public burden than most people realize. Here will be an opportunity to give a lot of men a chance to prove themselves. If they come out of the Army with a good record, with an honorable discharge, I see no reason why they should not be released. If they come out of the Army and do not have an honorable discharge, certainly they should go back and serve out their time. I believe this is something worthy of consideration.

I have not received a single letter nor have I had a single comment in opposition to this kind of thing. I hope the Military Affairs Committee of the House will, at an early date, take action on this bill to help these men to find their places, and thus relieve many fathers from duty, and permit these men to find their places in the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] be permitted to extend his remarks by including a letter written by one of his constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNPROVED RAYON THEORY THREATENS COTTON—GRANT OF REQUEST FOR EXPANSION OF RAYON PLANTS TO MAKE RAYON CORD FOR TIRES WOULD STRIKE SEVERE BLOW AT THE COTTON FARMER

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if a certain request now pending before the War Production Board is granted it may, and probably will, have the ultimate effect of doing irreparable harm to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the South. I refer to the pending application of the War Department for certain priorities and permission to expand and convert additional facilities to the manufacture of rayon cord to be used in synthetic tires to take the place of cotton cord that has always been used for that purpose.

So serious and so dangerous is this threat that the Truman Special Investigating Committee of the United States Senate spent several months in an ex-

tensive study and investigation of the subject. The committee filed a report on July 16, 1943, strongly urging the W. P. B. to defer the application in view of existing evidence, and concluded with the warning that if the program of conversion is carried out the South will lose about 10 percent of its normal domestic market for cotton.

It follows that the subject is of profound importance to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the Southland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts behind this proposal? There has already been an expansion, under high priorities, of facilities in existing rayon plants sufficient to provide rayon cord for 97,000,000 pounds of synthetic rubber. I am addressing my remarks now to a request that is now pending calling for the building of new and additional facilities that would provide rayon cord for an additional 100,000,000 pounds.

In view of the fact that this expansion and conversion program so seriously affects the cotton industry, which is one of this Nation's greatest enterprises, it follows that the change certainly cannot be justified unless it is made perfectly clear by thorough tests that the rayon cord is, in fact, superior to the cotton cord and that the change would be to the best interest of the war program.

TRUMAN COMMITTEE REPORT SAYS RAYON EXPANSION NOT JUSTIFIED

I have already spoken of the Truman report. At this point I should like to quote from the conclusions contained in that document:

1. The committee is convinced and strongly urges that further expansion of rayon-cord facilities, now recommended by the Rubber Director and approved in part by the War Production Board, be deferred until proper and complete tests of a standard which has not been met by tests to date will indicate with a reasonable degree of certainty whether or not further use of rayon cord will aid the war effort.

2. The tests conducted by the War Department failed to indicate superiority for rayon tire cord in the tire sizes for which the bulk of the new expansion would be used.

3. Expansion of rayon facilities would use large amounts of materials sorely needed by vital war industries. The strong profit possibilities to chemical companies generally, and war-expanded producers of cellulose in particular, should not be overlooked. Against this should be balanced the heavy damage to the economy of a large section of the United States. These considerations weigh heavily in any appraisal of contentions that rayon capacity should now be increased as insurance against the possibility that rayon may some day be proven superior to cotton. There is today under construction sufficient capacity for such insurance.

And the report contains this further significant statement:

The effect of the War Department predilection for rayon, whatever the merits of the controversy, will be a disaster to the post-war economy of the South—loss of 10 percent of the domestic cotton market.

COTTON-CORD QUALITY BEEN PROVEN

The four major rubber companies in this country have to some extent for some time been promoting the conversion from cotton cord to high-tensile

rayon. This was true before the war began, but the difficulty of the proposed conversion has been aggravated by the fact that the cotton cord for that purpose is from 25 to 50 percent less expensive than is rayon cord. During peacetime at least one of the big tire companies manufactured some premium rayon-cord tires. But at the same time that was being done, some independent concerns, who did much research in the uses of cotton cord, were able to compete with the rayon products on a mileage-guaranty basis. Therefore, up until the synthetic program got under way, cotton had held its own in the research laboratories as well as on the highways of this country. And since the wartime synthetic program was begun, the alleged superiority of rayon cord over cotton has not been proven or demonstrated by fair and convincing tests.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton cord used with natural rubber has been tested and its quality has been proven. Great advancement in the lasting qualities of tires using cotton cord has taken place in recent years. Prior to the war, cotton-cord capacity was more than 400,000,000 pounds, amounting to 96 percent of tire production in this country. As I have said, it was far less expensive to use. Moreover, each pound of rayon cord twisted requires machinery that could twist 1.7 pounds of cotton cord, and this advantage of cotton over rayon has been, and still is, an important factor, as the Truman report has pointed out.

But now we find the big tire companies and their associated rayon manufacturers are urging and advertising the added advantages of rayon-cord in tires. It has been pointed out that the rayon expansion program has to date been conducted in part on a basis of certificates of war necessity, and this will enable new facilities to be amortized for tax purposes, over a period of 5 years or the duration, whichever is shorter. The Truman committee shows that in part this is financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. At the end of the war, plants will have been built in which the big tire companies will have little or no investment. This fact may enable rayon-cord prices to be on an equality with the prices of cotton-cord tires.

TESTS REFUTE CLAIM OF RAYON SUPERIORITY

It is true that certain tests have been made upon which the War Department based its opinion that the superiority of rayon-tire cord was proven. But the Truman committee has exposed obvious flaws in the method and system employed in making those tests. The tests were under the supervision of men formerly connected with different major tire companies, and the personnel of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. actually conducted the tests.

In this connection and as bearing on the conclusiveness of these tests, in October and November of 1942, medium-size truck tires were tested and cotton there proved superior to rayon in natural rubber tires for military purposes, and other tests applied to synthetic tires have not supported the claim of rayon

superiority. After considerable controversy had arisen on the subject, Mr. Jeffers last fall appointed an independent tire-testing expert, C. R. Smith, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., to investigate the fairness of the tire-cord tests involved. After 6 weeks of intensive study and observation, Mr. Smith reported that the tests, upon which the War Department relied heavily, were incapable of producing accurate or reliable results. He recommended a fair and accurate method of testing that would remove any doubt as to the respective superiority of the two fabrics. The Truman committee has joined in that request.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the taxpayers are entitled to have a most thorough and complete test made before added expenditures are authorized for rayon expansion and before highly strategic war materials are diverted to this expanded program. The results of the outcome of this issue are of far-reaching importance. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry have a tremendous stake in the outcome. The burden is on the proponents of the proposal to change from cotton to rayon to prove their case before any agency of this Government should become a party to a program that would take from the cotton farmer 10 percent of his normal domestic market. Every reasonable doubt should be resolved in favor of the use of cotton cord. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry and all they mean to the economic life of the South and to the Nation are entitled to that simple consideration at the hands of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Week is being celebrated throughout the United States this week, approximately the two hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the founding of the first American newspaper. This country's first news sheet, called *Public Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestick* by its owner and publisher, Benjamin Harris, appeared in Boston in 1690. The first issue was printed on three pages of a folded sheet, leaving the last page blank, and was to be circulated about the county once a month. The aims of *Public Occurrences*, as stated by Harris in the maiden issue, were to make known "such considerable things as have arrived unto our notice," and to take steps toward "curing or at least charming that spirit of lying which prevails among us." Harris also promised that "nothing shall be entered herein but what we have reason to believe is true, repairing to the best fountains for our information," and added his willingness to "expose the names of such persons as are malicious raisers of false reports."

In the 2 days of its existence, *Public Occurrences* informed its readers that the Christianized Indians in Plymouth had appointed a day of thanksgiving, that two children had been stolen by Indians from the settlement of Chelms-

ford, that the smallpox was abating in Boston, and that there had been two fires in the vicinity. Also included among the "occurrences" was the news which proved to be Harris' undoing, a report of the expedition against the French and the use of the friendly Maquas Indians in the battles. His account of the savage treatment of French prisoners by the Indians was extremely displeasing to the authorities, even though the stout old man was speaking for the side of humanity and progress.

Several days later the legislative authorities officially forbade the printing of anything without a governmental license, which Harris did not have and could not get. For at this time the right to regulate the press had been granted in their instructions to each of the colonial governors.

Thus perished the infant publication, the sole point of contact between the great mass of people in America—a vast majority of whom did not even know of the existence of Benjamin Harris—and what we now call public opinion. This act of suppression of the first paper aroused no protest from the humble first settlers—the records, in fact, indicate that the suppression was regarded with a complacency tantamount to approval.

For that little Boston community had not, even as the world had not, yet grown to realize that freedom and liberty of conscience cannot be generally or individually obtained without freedom of opinion and discussion. Harris, in his *Public Occurrences*, was alone in protesting against conditions of his day as opposed to affairs as they should ideally be. He stands out individually as the personification of democracy, of rule of, for, and by the people through public opinion.

He represented the democratic ideal, the theory of public rights, and when he attempted to materialize his ideal through the medium of the yet young printing press, he was suppressed. And as he was alone in his ideals and the upholding of them through actual practice, so was he alone in his protestations against this governmental check. For in the midst of his colony founded on the idea of public rights and liberty, its citizens failed to recognize that within themselves they were creating an autocracy just as binding and hateful as the one from which they had escaped across the ocean. And they were silent and approving as the Governor tied and crushed Harris and his dream. They were as silent then as they are today.

But, like other colonial and revolutionary casualties, it is today easily and glibly said that *Public Occurrences*, the materialization of the democratic ideal, did not die in vain nor will it today. Today the journalistic system has slowly evolved to a point where the people of America are given the fullest measure of control of their existence through the public newspapers. They have come into direct sponsorship of the Government in their representation by the press. Every section and group of individual citizens has a delegate and trustee to his Government in the form of his daily

news sheet, battling for his share of attention and consideration in a democracy where the will of the people is reputedly the law of the land, however, since the invasion of the field of the press by the O. W. I., it is questionable whether this principle is still the law of the land.

The journalistic profession, in its high regard for the simple truth, completes the most competent circle of delegation of power and return that has ever existed. It has devised its own responsive and elastic system of checks. It keeps its avenues for complaints wide open. The continued support of its readers through the years is the only real proof of whether any news organ has achieved its high aims. The existence of the newspaper depends upon its service of that incomprehensible thing, the public. For the democratic citizens are, and must be, free to choose the media through which they wish to be expressed and through which they gain their information. The people have tried out their papers and in them, and in the men who bring the news into being, America is trusting and confident.

Extreme indifference on the part of the American people of the usurpation of their rights might again find us confronted with a situation such as Harris found in 1690. My recommendation to the Congress is to abolish the O. W. I., and turn over to an American unstrangled press, where it rightfully belongs, the handling of the news. During this newspaper week the Congress should resolve to take the shackles off the American press and that America shall be told what they want to know, and that is the truth of what is happening.

Over the years the American press has given a magnificent performance and they deserve our heartfelt thanks rather than the shabby treatment now being dished to them by so-called brilliant intellectuals of the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHEATING THE NAVY OF PLANES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from yesterday's *Washington Post*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the *Washington Post* of yesterday, on page 3-B, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of the publisher and owner of the *Washington Post*, paints a picture that is, to say the least, very startling. But there is not anything new in what she writes. Months ago people who knew about the situation which confronts the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, about which she writes, were here in Washington, and they told of the situation which then existed in this plant, which was one which prevented production.

The facts were given to the Navy, or, more accurately, in the first instance to the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman Vinson, of the House Committee on Naval

Affairs, to whom I wrote on the 9th of February last. I myself presented them to the officer sent up by the Navy, who had his office in the old House Office Building. They made an investigation. They found the facts to be as presented to them. They did nothing about it.

The only purpose of putting this article into the RECORD now is because of the source from which it comes. Patriotic Americans, a hundred of them or a thousand of them might speak on the same situation and call attention to the remedy, and the Washington Post would not pay any attention to it nor would people generally. But the wife of the publisher and editor goes up there, as she has gone to other plants, and then we get it in the press. We get publicity on it. Let us hope that something comes of it.

In printing this story, the Post is rendering a patriotic service. My only regret is that it did not print the truth about the situation back in the early days of 1943—yes, and prior to that date. As far back as 1939, from the well of the House, attention was called to the situation at Detroit, where the C. I. O. for 42 days, held up production of materials for the Navy and denied the Navy's request for the return of its own patterns and plans.

All that went into the RECORD, verified as it was by a letter from Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison. It was all glossed over. My statement made on the floor of the House was regarded as just a few more idle words from one who was falsely characterized as a labor-baiter.

Now the Navy—yes and the Army and the War Production Board—is reaping the benefit of its own indifference, its own neglect, its own surrender to the labor politicians.

But the Washington Post should not complain. It and the New Deal, which it has supported in season and out, day and night, while the foundations have been laid for what she pictures here, has furnished the canvas, the paint, and the brushes—has furnished everything which finally brought about this situation.

Now, she talks with this union leader and she quotes him in this way:

He, De Lorenzo, the head of the C. I. O., is speaking. Listen to this quotation from him:

Our policy is not to win the war at any cost.

The policy of this great union, whose activity, according to Mrs. Meyer, has resulted in the loss of 65 planes—they are short 65 planes because of strikes—with the resulting stoppage of work, since May 31, 1942. Their policy is not to win the war; they do not intend to win the war, so they say; they do not intend to get out the planes; at least, that is what they say, speaking through their leadership, if they must sacrifice any of their union rights to do it.

With De Lorenzo the labor union comes first—before the United States of America. Putting it another way, John Jones, a member of the union, does not propose that John Smith who joined the union after he did, shall work over in that corner of the plant, if he is in position to do it, even though plane produc-

tion is stopped when John Jones has been a member of the union longer than John Smith.

That statement is not made by a Republican Congressman. That statement is not made by a Member of the House of Representatives. That statement, according to the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, was made by the union leader.

Men who were members of the Coast Guard Reserve, but who were also members of the union; men who by their oath pledged allegiance to the Government of the United States, disregarded their sworn duty, followed the orders of the union when those orders ran contrary to the orders given by the Navy.

The Navy caused them to be arrested. They were thrown in the brig. They were tried. They were convicted of violating the orders given by their superior officers in the Navy and they were sentenced to prison. But a high administration official, whether in the Navy I do not know, commuted the sentences and the men were given back their jobs. That information comes from the daily press. It has not been denied by the naval authorities. So far, it stands uncontradicted.

The men in the Solomons, on the other war fronts, who are in the Navy, accept the orders of their superiors, even though it may mean death to them. But here in Philadelphia, safe and secure in their homes, with jobs paying top wages, these union men, although they were in the service of the Government, took—perhaps because they were forced to do so—the orders of the union boss, defied Uncle Sam in time of war and, when convicted of such disobedience of orders, were, by the politicians of this administration—and do not forget that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the Navy and gives the orders—permitted to escape punishment; were actually rewarded for disobedience.

If that sort of procedure does not tend to undermine the morale of our men in the armed service, can you tell me what would? Does not that sort of procedure come under the definition of sedition? Where is Prosecutor Maloney and his grand jury?

I suggest that you read this article. It comes from an administration supporter; it comes from one of the newspapers which, for the last 8 years, come hell or high water, has supported the New Deal philosophy, the New Deal's policies. Now they find out what they have been hatching; they are getting the crop from the seed they have been sowing; they find what they have been working to produce, and they have it here in an organization which says, "We will win the war, but we will not win the war if winning the war requires us to let go of any of our union rules and regulations."

Now let me read to you from the other side of this page, where we see some of the reasons why union men were discharged and why production was stopped.

On June 24, 25, and 26 a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company

dismissed for loafing and refusing to work, three women, which they had a perfect right to do. And in protest the union called a strike.

In this article Mrs. Meyer places a large part of the blame on the management, forgetting that the Washington Post has supported the administration throughout in its determination and in the policy which it has followed of changing the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Co. The management in that company is the management selected by the Navy and the boards of the administration, and yet she comes along and says that the fault, a large part of it, rests upon the management.

The management which Mrs. Meyer blames is the management given to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation by this administration itself. When the first labor dispute arose, the administration took the side of the union leaders and, because the company would not yield to the union's demand that it—the union—be given the controlling voice in the operation of the plant, the management of the corporation was fired and a new management, selected by the Navy, or perhaps more accurately, by the administration, was placed in charge.

From that day to this, this administration has been responsible for the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; it has been responsible for its failures, because it has never supported the management when a controversy arose between management and labor.

Let us take courage from the fact that the Post, evidently following the lead of the Philadelphia papers, has decided to throw a little light on the situation which exists in this great plant.

The management discharged these women for loafing. They were not working; they were drawing their wages; they were hindering production; they were refusing to produce, as were others. Then what happened? The union called and kept in force the strike which further hindered production. No one would believe this story if I had written it, but here is a statement of a labor representative, the head of the union, Tom De Lorenzo. And here is an administration paper, you might say, which says he made that statement. Now, talk about seditionists, talk about the activities of the so-called seditionists and the thirty-three-odd who have been referred to as seditionists who have been indicted, but what about the 21,000 workers up here who Mrs. Meyer says, in this article, were hindering production and would not continue production—could not continue, because of the orders of Tom De Lorenzo—if it interfered in any way with the members of "my—his—organization."

One of the men who refused to go out, who was fired by the union—and there was no court procedure, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, no court procedure; the union held its own court, a kangaroo court; no law, no justice, and they disciplined this man; he was a man charged with watching a flyer who was then in the air, who had a pilot in the

air, because he said, "I am not going to go off the job until my man lands; I cannot do otherwise."

So the union fired or disciplined him. The writer of this article, at another point, calls attention to what happened when she states:

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Stano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibility until the plane returned. Before the Board he said in strong language that he could not leave his pilot in the air. Therefore, he was cited for using language not becoming to brother workers, and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

In conclusion the article states:

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. * * *

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easy-going descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Are we all to be called upon to sacrifice, to spend, and to do without in order to win the war and then have the administration give support to, as it has, as it does, and as it will continue to do—to these union leaders who say: "You shall not have planes unless you comply with what I request"? I ask you in all sincerity, if a year ago I had said outside of this Hall that the Army and the Navy should not have planes, should not have guns, unless they complied with certain requests that I named, how long would it have taken Brother William Powers Maloney and his grand jury down here to have indicted me for sedition? Is not Tom De Lorenzo doing more to decrease production of planes needed by the armed forces, doing more to depress our fighting men and our people when he says we will not get planes, when he says we will get them the union way or not at all, than anything or all the whole 33 indicted ever did?

If our leaders in business and in industry appear now to be easygoing, as Agnes Meyer reports, in my judgment it is not due to any fault on their part but to the realization that, if they assert their independence; if they follow the method which will give our country needed production of war materials; if they are efficient; if their policy or their methods run counter to the interests of the labor politicians, the strong arm of the administration will force them into the way, make them travel the road, which the labor politicians desire.

That has been shown time and again. All too often in the past, when ambitious labor leaders, anxious to establish and to maintain their power, made un-American demands upon management, followed lawless methods, this administration, on the order of the President himself, has taken over private industry, put it under Government operation, given the union leaders what they demanded, and, in practically every instance, lessened production and increased the cost to the taxpayer.

Illustration after illustration might be cited. One of the most outrageous was that when the Government took over the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad.

The administration has been, and it is, playing politics with certain labor leaders. It is directly responsible for the chaos at Brewster. In return for the mess which it has made of things, for the special privileges which it has granted to certain favored labor leaders, they now announce their support of the fourth term.

Glad, indeed, may loyal, patriotic Americans be that the Washington Post at last is beginning to realize the kind of a harvest which the American people will be forced to reap from the seeds which it assisted this administration in sowing.

At last, from a great publication which, through thick and thin, has consistently supported the New Deal, we have a story which shows beyond controversy that at least one policy of this administration is hindering a more efficient prosecution of the war. The administration seems to be more intent on maintaining its political fences than it is in the volume and the quality of the production of planes.

Because the article in the Post comes from a source which can under no circumstances be charged with being either antiadministration or antilabor; because it is so factual, so revealing, and because it so clearly, in spite of the writer's apparent admiration for Mr. De Lorenzo, sets forth the vicious, unpatriotic, and un-American tactics of Mr. Tom De Lorenzo and leaders who share his views it is printed as a part hereof:

CHAOS AND TYRANNY COMPETE BITTERLY AT BREWSTER PLANT—INCOMPETENT MANAGEMENT IS HOPELESSLY ENSNARED BY SHREWED, RUTHLESS UNION AUTOCRATS

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

As the management-labor relations of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and its failure to get production have become notorious throughout the Nation, I was reckless enough to inject myself into this hurly-burly for a solid week of intensive investigation.

After interviews with labor leaders and management at the Long Island City and Newark plants, I went through the Johnsville plant, just 12 miles north of the Philadelphia line, which was made famous by the guard strike.

Never did I expect to see in America such a picture of managerial chaos, such a complete break-down of worker morale, as this factory presents.

Right and left were men and women idling, laughing, talking, or just sitting inert at empty benches. Some work was going on here and there in a half-hearted kind of way. Three women sitting under semicompleted fuselages made a pretense of activity when I strolled by with a member of the managerial staff. But such concessions to supervisory authority were rare. When one girl was reproved by her foreman for taking time off to make up her face on the assembly line, she looked up calmly and asked, "So what?"

WHAT DO WE CARE?

The toilets are frequented by people taking a smoke, and when Mr. Steele, factory superintendent, who is popular with the rank and file, tried on one occasion to eject them and introduce a semblance of discipline two of the workers replied, "All right, take our numbers. What do we care?"

A similar state of things already had been described to me by workers and management

alike at the Long Island City and Newark plants. But to see it for one's self is to realize that even though such a production fiasco is not typical of industry throughout the Nation something is radically wrong in our country when even one such instance can occur.

Only once before have I witnessed such a total break-down of management and worker morale. It was in Paris under the Blum regime when that friend of the workers had given the labor unions the green light.

Exactly the same sabotage of our war effort—the same kind of break-down which in France was the prelude to defeat—is taking place in the Brewster factories.

Who is to blame? An objective study of the conditions in these plants and of their origin is important, not only because of the critical nature of this one situation but because of the light it throws upon some of our most fundamental problems in labor relations.

COMPANY HISTORY

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring. Prior to 1938 the company operated only in Long Island City, manufacturing airplanes and parts with 500 employees. In 1937 the plant was unionized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O., as Local 365, the contract providing that all future plants should be under the same jurisdiction. Mr. Work granted the union shop and anything else the union leadership demanded in exchange for a low wage scale.

The union leaders accepted low pay rates because they felt confident they could attend to those later, under contractual provisions that are now recognized by all labor-relations experts as among the most restrictive that can be found in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. today.

The company's growth began in 1939 when foreign orders came in. That year a second plant was opened in Newark, N. J., and in 1941 the third one was opened at Johnsville, Pa. Today the company employs 21,000 people, but at no time has production been satisfactory.

As one Navy man put it: "They never had any real production at Brewster, and what they did produce wasn't any good."

The British contracts were canceled last week. The remaining orders are principally for the Navy which, inclusive of the British, amounted to \$250,000,000.

So alarming was the situation in April 1942, that the Navy took over the plants and properties by Executive order of the President and turned them back in May of the same year, under new directors and a new management headed by C. A. Van Dusen, a man of reputation in the airplane field, who lasted for a year without achieving any improvement in production.

MORE STALLING

Van Dusen was convinced that no progress in efficiency could be made under the present contract, which expired in January, 1943. He began negotiations with the union committee that went on for months without final agreement. When certain clauses were settled to mutual satisfaction, the union negotiating committees said that before submitting the case to the War Labor Board, they would have to submit the agreements to their membership.

After a month's delay, they reported that the members had rejected the clauses agreed upon.

The union vote is a farce, as later statements by the workers will prove; this whole technique of stalling and wearing out the management's patience is used by Local 365 in large as in small matters.

When Fred Riebel, now the president of the company, continued the negotiations for a new contract, the same performance took place all over again.

The expired contract is still recognized by both parties for lack of a new one. "Van Dusen was broken trying to get a new contract," said one of the men who had worked with him. "He refused to go into the shop because it simply meant an incessant bombardment of trouble."

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

What kind of trouble? Instead of repeating hearsay, I shall begin by describing the complex nature of these incessant shop upheavals with my own personal experience.

Last Tuesday as I was sitting in the office of Marco Cicala, vice president of Local 365, the telephone rang. Cicala went to town in no uncertain way.

"Don't you know you can't make changes without consulting our shop committee?" he snapped over the wire. "Say, listen, George, ye're talkin' to Marco."

The conversation was ended. "Whom are you dusting off in that fashion?" I ventured. It was George Schwobel, plant manager of the Long Island City factory, one of the highest executives of the company.

THE ARGUMENT

The argument was this. The company had engaged MacDonald Bros., nationally known engineering experts, to establish a method of reporting production with a view to encouraging greater efficiency. For 3 weeks, after Mr. Schwobel had consulted the union stewards in this department, the group leaders in certain sections of the wing department, Ford Building, had furnished time recorders with the starting and finishing time of jobs.

During these 3 weeks with the same manpower and equipment, merely by keeping records, average production had been raised from 15 to 21 spars, or approximately 40 percent.

The night before, Al Nash, a "B" assembler under the group leaders, but their superior in his capacity as chief union steward of the wing department, had arbitrarily ordered the men to discontinue the timekeeping in spite of its beneficial effects on production.

In order to be sure the management was accurate in its description of events, I asked to be present while Al Nash was questioned by President Riebel. Asked if he had ordered the men to stop, he replied he "had merely told them it was O. K. not to do it, because they did not like the procedure."

Asked whether he would agree to stop interfering with management orders, he said he would agree to nothing until he had consulted the shop committee, and the fact that he was interfering with production made no difference. "The men were objecting violently to the time study," he added, "feeling the company is checking up on them. They are getting resentful and suspicious, which will tend to affect production." Thereupon Riebel fired Nash and a shop committee management meeting had to be called at once. Both parties sent hot telegrams to the War Labor Board for its decision on this minor item of shop routine.

Now the staggering point about this debate is that Al Nash was within his rights according to the prevailing contract, because the management had consulted only the shop stewards before making an innovation and not the whole shop committee.

OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

The incident illustrated for me what Fred Riebel, appointed by the Navy in March to succeed Van Dusen as president, had said about the contract:

"If it is strictly invoked by labor, management has no prerogatives. It cannot hire or transfer men, change shifts, use discipline, or do anything else without the O. K. of the shop committee, and every single move involves such lengthy arguments that thousands of man-hours are lost over the slightest move the management tries to make. The

union leaders can do as they please, how, when, and where."

Such purely obstructive tactics are daily occurrences and appear to be flagrant exhibitions of union domination. At Johnsville recently a worker hit a company foreman over the head with a chair, wounding him in the face. Before the company could dismiss this man, the case had to be taken to the shop committee, then to arbitration, with lawyers employed on both sides. After more than 3 weeks of litigation, the man was finally discharged at a cost of more than a thousand dollars to the management in lawyer's fees.

Yet when the union sends an employee undesirable to it, flying, the company would have to enter into endless debate to keep him. So it meekly accepts the union verdict, no matter how valuable the man may be, for the sake of peace, and because the management is already devoting almost all its time to union meetings and arguments instead of to production.

By such methods the union has taken over from management the power of dismissal, and the workers know it.

As I shall show later, the union has not built up its stranglehold on the company overnight nor solely on the contract, but through the continuous and brilliant leadership of a powerful personality, its president, Tom De Lorenzo, who has taken shrewd advantage of the company's incompetence and of changing management over a period of years.

Managements have come and gone, but the union and Tom De Lorenzo have been on the job uninterruptedly, establishing precedents and customs to augment their legal hold upon the company and its employees. But if past managements have been inefficient, De Lorenzo now finds himself confronted with a bird of different feathers, for in March when the Navy appointed Riebel as president, it also put in Henry J. Kaiser, the west-coast wizard, as chairman of the board. So far Mr. Kaiser left everything in Mr. Riebel's hands, but as of yesterday he made his first move by appointing Harry Morton to take over labor relations.

UNION MADE THE BOSS

But before we enter the field of personalities, let us take a look at some of the major provisions of the contract. The maintenance-of-membership clause is absolute, but the executives are not opposed to the closed shop; in itself this situation is not different from that of other closed-shop plants, but this clause and a rigid insistence upon seniority have enabled the union to undermine every last vestige of managerial control.

Paul Krebs, secretary of the union and De Lorenzo's man Friday, told me that they insist upon observance of seniority at any price, even that of production, because they must protect the future of the union's membership when the war is over and the layoffs begin. Seniority like the closed shop has its merit, but this is a question of the abuse of a legitimate union principle.

At Brewster, seniority is used, together with strikes, slow-ups, and constant obstruction of transfers, to prove to the company who is boss.

The Coast Guard strike at Johnsville is a case in point as this whole rumpus hinged on the right of the guards to bid for their posts according to seniority at the expiration of every 6 months. This practice had not hitherto existed but it had taken place once, and on that basis, the union claimed that it was a good old-fashioned custom.

The union leadership felt its accumulated power. It announced that as of August 23, the guards insisted upon bidding for posts. In the union leaders' favor is their assertion that the Navy had promised that membership in the Coast Guard would not nullify

the men's union status. The Navy claims it said no such thing.

In any case, the Navy has to have flexibility in changing the guards as the protection of valuable materials and the handling of people, at the gate, for example, are very different jobs. When the fatal August 23 arrived, four men refused to accept their Navy assignment, and were promptly thrown in the brig. Last week the War Labor Board ruled that in the new agreement, "nothing shall be construed in any way to interfere with the organization, training, and control by the Navy Department of the company guard force."

UNION LOSES A DECISION

The union took its first defeat philosophically, but the very fact that it was willing to take on the Navy, and called a strike to prove it, shows how heady the behavior of Local 365, U. A. W., can be. The cost of the strike was 164,000 man-hours of work or the equivalent of about 15 planes.

The incident also demonstrated to the public what the Brewster company has to contend with day in, day out, and it will make more credible to what fantastic lengths the union goes in its interference with daily management to uphold its seniority rule.

Until the War Manpower Commission recently insisted upon a better balance of the day and night shifts, the night shift was hobbling along on a skeleton crew because most of the skilled workers who have the seniority refused to accept night duty and couldn't be forced to accept it against their will.

Three weeks ago a new fighter line was instituted at Johnsville which was still out of balance between skilled and unskilled workers when I was there last week because the shifting of workers from one department to the other, or for that matter within the department, is always attended by endless talk back and forth between the shop committee, the workers, and the management during which incalculable numbers of man-hours are lost.

BETWEEN DEVIL AND SEA

Do such conditions mean that the 21,000 Brewster workers are less patriotic than those at other factories? Not in the least. It means that they are confused as to where their torn loyalties should lie, because the union has real power over their destinies, their chance to work and to progress, and the company has none.

Even the company foremen say to themselves: "The management changes, but if I'm not at loggerheads with the union, I'll still be a foreman when the latest management goes." The union's power over the worker is such that it can and does stage a strike, a walk-out, or a slow-up on the most trivial pretext.

Since May 31, 1942, there have been 13 different stoppages or slow-ups and strikes which the company calculates as costing 719,337 man-hours, or the time it takes to make 65 military planes. In money wasted they represent between one and two million dollars. This does not include the amount of time which is wasted daily by loafing on the job.

MANAGEMENT INCOMPETENT

But before I show how this labor union leadership has consolidated its power, it should be stated that this loafing is not all due to the workers' confused state of mind. Much of it is due to past and present incompetence on the part of management.

When I was in the Johnsville plant some 25 women workers surrounded me to talk because the welding department had nothing to do. They claimed that they had had very little to do for the past 2 months.

"When work comes in, we fight for it" said one of them, "because we are so anxious

to work." "I've been here 3 weeks" wailed another, "and I'm not getting any experience."

In several of the other departments it was the same story, now a lack of tools, now a lack of materials. "Production planning in Brewster has always been bad," said one foreman, "and is getting rapidly worse."

Riebel, the president, himself said that this was one of the company's weaknesses, but much of it he blamed on the national over-all planning for the aircraft industry. But I have been in enough airplane factories to know that though shortage of materials hampers all of them to some extent, I have never seen such acute, widespread, and apparently continuous shortages as bedevil the Brewster plants.

ABSENTEEISM ACCEPTED

But this is not the only weakness of management to be seen even by so inexperienced an observer as I. Discipline of the workers is nonexistent, which, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that respect for the union exceeds that for management. But management seems to have signed off to an extent which must be humiliating. The problem of absenteeism which is acute in all three factories is looked upon as inevitable. Among women it is 12 percent, the average for all employees 8 percent.

My questions as to what management was doing to combat absenteeism were considered surprising, as if it were just an act of God and nobody's fault.

Turn-over is low in all three plants. Though the workers do not separate themselves from the pay roll as readily as in most airplane factories, they seem to stay away or come in late whenever they please. Only in extreme cases are workers dismissed for absenteeism. The company is now initiating a program for combating it.

HOW UNION PROFITS

What probably contributes to absenteeism is that so many of the workers have little or nothing to do, and it certainly is a great factor in the lack of morale among the employees.

It was constant mismanagement of this sort in the past 4 years which gave the union its chance to consolidate its powers.

The first fight was conducted on an improvement of haphazard wage rates. This defined the union as the workers' friend and protector. As soon as the other plants were opened, the union set about improving its organization until it is a perfect tool for shop control.

Under the president is a vice president in each of the three plants, as well as a chairman of the joint shop committee, a chairman of each separate shop committee, and under them section stewards, whose number is in proportion to the size of the department, each handling about 75 men.

One former steward informed me that these stewards are given systematic instructions in a technique for harassing the management.

Formerly the management also had leadmen, union members, in charge of small groups which left the management completely devoid of control at the lowest level. The Treasury stabilization unit permitted the company to raise the leadmen's salaries and promote them to be section subforemen, non-union positions. After a 3-month battle this improvement in management's position took place, though the union is still fighting for the replacement of these leadmen for the purpose of controlling supervision.

In addition, there is a union executive board of 17 men who are on the company pay roll, sometimes to the tune of \$8,000, although they devote their whole time to the affairs of the union. This means about \$100,000 of taxpayers' money in the union's pocket, since the company is largely on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. This is a mat-

ter of public record in the War Labor Board proceedings.

THE TRIAL BOARD

One of the most important factors in union control is its trial board. The union shop, together with the vague seniority clause which the union can always reinterpret to suit immediate objectives, gives the union leaders complete control of shop operations. The trial board adds to these powers an almost tyrannical control of the workers themselves.

Moreover, the union has not hesitated to use this instrument as a star chamber for the punishment of the slightest infringement of its orders. To be sure, the court is elected, but the ticket can be fixed through union caucus methods.

The source of the Board's influence arises from the fact that it cannot only fine and suspend union members but expel them and make it impossible for the victim to secure another job in any union shop. The worker has the right of appeal to the international U. A. W.-C. I. O., and thence to the civil courts, but a worker without a job can scarcely afford such costly proceedings.

As a result, the influence of the Board is felt by all of the workers as an intimidating force.

Some cases of which I secured photostatic records will illustrate the lengths to which the Board goes in its disciplinary sentences. On June 24, 25, 26, a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company dismissed for loafing in a fuselage three women who were still in the probationary period, which it had a perfect right to do.

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Spano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibilities until the plane returned. Called before the Board, he said in strong language that he couldn't leave his pilot in the air. Thereupon he was cited for "using language unbecoming to brother workers" and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

Among a list of some 30 cases are such union charges as "giving orders in his department without authority," "insubordination to department stewards," "reporting union brother in violation of company rules to a management supervisor" (this for reporting with witnesses a fellow member asleep during working hours). The most frequent charge is "remaining at work during a stoppage." These court decisions have to be upheld by the union membership, but woe betide any worker who would dare raise his hand in open opposition to a decision of the trial body.

The union power to intimidate workers was most clearly illustrated in the famous guard strike at Johnsville.

The employees, not singly but in large groups, assured me that they did not want to go out on that occasion; that they not only disapproved of the strike but were still ashamed of it.

"Then," said I, "why did you all vote for it the day after it was called?" They explained that there is no secret ballot on strikes or any other union matters except the election of union officials. They did not dare oppose the union decision. They were indignant at the fact that they have no secret ballot.

Although these urban workers are more union-minded than those in most large war industries, they are thoroughly unhappy about their lack of freedom. "We have good wages now," said one young man, "but the Brewster employees have found out that wages alone cannot make a man happy. We are just as patriotic as any other Americans. We don't like these slow-ups and strikes. Some of us are ashamed of the fact that we work in a factory with such a reputation,

but when the shop steward points toward the door with his thumb we have to go or get in 'dutch.' The worst of it is that hard work and ability count for nothing in this set-up. If you want to stay in this place and get along or be upgraded, you have to stand in with the shop stewards."

"The company foremen can't do a thing for you. You have to be in with the clique that runs the show."

IN CONCLUSION

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. The leaders of labor, especially of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., are among the ablest men in the country and not infrequently the superiors of their managements. These labor leaders have had to battle their way to the top just as management did two or three generations ago.

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easygoing descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Fortunately the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has among its international leaders men very different from Tom De Lorenzo, men like Walter Reuther who have a statesmanlike point of view. Walter Reuther said to me when I last saw him in Detroit:

"The time has come when labor leaders must modify their purely aggressive techniques and learn to cooperate with management if private industry is to survive in America."

What America seems to need in the field of management is more Henry Kaisers. The active intervention in the Brewster situation of this production genius began last week with the appointment of his west coast trouble shooter, Harry Morton, to take charge of labor relations. If he can teach Tom De Lorenzo the meaning of the word "cooperation," Mr. Kaiser will not only get out the planes, but his contribution to Tom's education might save the Nation a lot of trouble in the post-war world.

TOM DE LORENZO IS JUST STARTING—BREWSTER UNION DICTATOR IS FORMIDABLE AND ASTONISHING

After gathering the amazing picture of a beautifully organized tyranny (discussed in the adjoining columns), I was naturally curious to see the man whom everybody gave the somewhat dubious credit of being the unquestioned dictator, not only of the union at the Brewster plant, but of the whole situation, Tom De Lorenzo, president of Local 365.

I expected a forceful personality, but what I could see in this firmly built 35-year-old American of Italian descent was a good deal more than I expected.

If I am any judge of people, the country is going to hear a lot more from Tom De Lorenzo.

He was born and grew up in New York, in a section of the city where every boy has to fight his way from the moment he is out of diapers. De Lorenzo is still fighting his way upward. It is my impression that nobody can stop him.

As there was no use mincing my language with this two-fisted, forthright labor leader, I confronted him at once with his statement to the company president, Mr. Riebel, at a meeting with the negotiating committee:

"Our policy is not to win the war at any cost. The policy of our local union is to win the war without sacrificing too many of the rights which we have at the present time."

"That sounds to me as if you put your union above your country," I asserted.

"I'm willing to take a chance and talk frankly to you," came the surprising response, "because I like your husband's letter on Congressman Cox. Any newspaper that cares

that much about civil liberties may give even a labor leader a fair hearing. My statement to Riebel was made negatively because I wanted to make clear what the union is trying to do within the shop, and that the company can't get anywhere by merely trying to out-negotiate the union."

QUESTIONS COMPANY'S SINCERITY

"Don't you believe the company is carrying on those negotiations for the sole purpose of getting production?"

"No, I don't."

There was no use trying to break down his conviction that the company is trying to undermine union rights, so I gave that up and changed the subject.

"What is your reaction to the War Labor Board's decision that the Navy must control the guards?"

"I expected it. The War Labor Board had to give the military forces precedence over civil rights in time of war and, therefore, I bow to their decision. In fact, if I had known that our men were subject to court martial and jail for disobedience I would have told the guards to obey. I would never have let those men risk going to jail. The strike was not sound because we had no chance of winning."

"But what about the other strikes and slow-downs?" I countered. "In speaking of strikes at his news conference on the War Labor Board decision, W. H. Davis said that strikes are not only illegal now, under the 'no-strike clause,' they are in effect not strikes against a company but against the Nation and the war effort. On that basis you are sabotaging production and endangering the national safety."

As patiently as if I had asked him the time of day, he answered:

"I have one goal or aim; I want the war over as soon as possible, but I want conditions to be no worse in the country than when we started. The most important thing in this war is to preserve the system of government that we have, among other things, and the procedure for adjudicating union troubles. There is no sense in winning the war if we are going to lose all those privileges."

HAS TO WEIGH HIS CHANCES

"All right, but if everybody thought and acted the way you do, we wouldn't have enough production to win the war and then where would your union privileges be?"

"I have to weigh how far I can go," was the astounding but honest reply.

"All my life I have found force to be the only effective weapon. Sometimes you just have to use it, even if it means stopping the planes. It has always been effective until the guard situation arose. And I'm sure if we had laid out that strike more effectively, we would have won that point, too."

"If I had brothers at the front who needed the 10 or 12 planes that were sacrificed, I'd let them die, if necessary, to preserve our way of life or rights or whatever you want to call it. Democracy is too broad and meaningless a term. What's more, if I were in their place, I'd expect them to do the same thing. I'd expect them to let me die."

"The real trouble with the Brewster Co. is that we have never had an efficient management. The people the Navy has put in here know nothing about manufacturing airplanes, and they don't know anything about getting on with people. Sometimes I am convinced that it would be best for the Navy to shut down the Brewster plants and let the people go work somewhere else where there is efficient management."

HOPES FOR IMPROVEMENT NOW

"But if management is inefficient, our union has a first-rate organization. Under our contract we can stop any innovations in which we do not believe. But what I want to prove above all things, and especially to the

Navy Department, is that we can be of use to the war effort if we are utilized properly by an efficient management such as H. J. Kaiser is famous for and can give us."

"I know that with Harry Morton (Kaiser's recent appointment), in charge of labor relations, things will improve. And with Kaiser sending in some people who know something about production, Kaiser style, I am convinced that all the men in the shop, in spite of being union members, will be interested in winning this war as quickly as possible, and will prove it to the world by producing the ships we need."

That was a conciliatory ending and I am sure the man meant it. But at this very moment he is at the U. A. W.-C. I. O. convention fighting with the support of a majority of the delegates from local 365 for the abrogation of the no-strike clause.

Such an attitude during war, as well as the statement he made to me, will be condemned by many people. But it should not be forgotten that a tough, competitive environment produced Tom De Lorenzo, made him the formidable mind and character that he is, and led him to believe through hard experience that nothing but force can be relied upon by those who want to survive.

In the 3 years of his union leadership, he has encountered only managers who confirmed his faith in force by going down before him like a lot of ninepins, thus making it easy for him to build up what he calls unions rights, but which are, in fact, tyrannical powers that represent a menace not only to the Brewster Co. but to the sound development of the labor movement.

AGNES E. MEYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a few remarks I had intended to make for the past 2 weeks but have been unable to, and to attach thereto an editorial from the Detroit Free Press, dated September 23 of this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed by, and somewhat suspicious of, the press reports regarding the possible shift of Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff. Particularly disturbing and unbelievable were reports that a prospective change in status for this great warrior-leader entailed, under whatever title or pretense, a demotion rather than advancement. Of course, I hold General Marshall in highest esteem. I rate him as one of the greatest soldiers and military leaders that this Nation ever produced. He is plain, persevering, and productive, a master strategist whose abilities have been recognized by his superiors even in the First World War. His name and fame is not known alone in this country or the Western Hemisphere but throughout the entire world. Though of positive character, he is soft-spoken, kindly, and thoroughly human. I believe his character embraces all of the fine attributes of a Christian gentleman, of an American, of a man.

I believe his very fine qualities, his experience, and his great accomplishments

have been recognized by the highest authorities in the land. First among these was the Chief Executive, his Commander in Chief, when he considered and named George C. Marshall as Chief of Staff from a field of brilliant generals among whom more than one rated by seniority the post of Chief of Staff. The President, in his wisdom, elevated to the leadership of our armies this modest though capable officer because he believed beyond any doubt that George C. Marshall was deserving, because he was preeminently qualified. I believe, in fact I am confident, there was no extraneous, no unwholesome motive in the President's choice at the time of his selection, and the brilliant record of the present Chief of Staff since his elevation justified the President's action and proved his excellent judgment of men. Why, then, would anyone today have cause to infer, assume, or presume that the President of the United States would, after continuing by reappointment General Marshall as Chief of Staff, undertake by some means or method to seek his demotion at this the most critical time in our Nation's history?

I feel that I would like to go along with General Marshall in the fulfillment of any role which he himself might choose. Not being a military expert, I do not know for a certainty whether it would be an added honor to General Marshall's brilliant military career were he chosen to lead the final and all-out invasion of the Nazi-held European stronghold, but it appears that it would be a great and an historical achievement if, with his valiant sword, he pointed the way for the millions of young Americans who would thus follow him toward the liberation of the oppressed and the restoration of human freedom throughout the world. It is particularly true, if reports as yet unfounded are worthy of credence, that both Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt decided upon making of Marshall the leader in the global war and the generalissimo of all of the American-British forces throughout the world.

It is unfortunate that Marshall's name should be bandied about so recklessly by irresponsible scribes and newspaper pharisees who, as Roosevelt haters, underhandedly are seeking to discredit the President as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and that such reprehensible methods would be employed at this particular time, the time when the Nation needs unity more than it needs anything else to accomplish the one great purpose which was expressed with our declaration of war against the Axis. It must be a great disappointment and unjustified embarrassment to this great and retiring soldier. As usual, he is silent while a synthetic storm is raging, occupied with the manifold and complex problems of an indescribably difficult task.

As a soldier he will prove his greatness by serving his country wherever he may be called. The Commander in Chief will, I am sure, promote General Marshall as he deserves to be. No one in this country needs plead the cause of the Army's foremost leader because his value was

recognized by the President far in advance of the rest of the people, and, since Marshall has proved his capacity even to the inclusion of those who may have had some doubt, certainly the President would be the last to do him an injustice by any demotion at this time. I am sure that whatever course the Commander in Chief shall choose will have for its lofty purpose the further recognition and the employment of Marshall's outstanding leadership and ability.

Plans, tactics, and stratagems of this war are fundamentally and substantially those of the modest though able Chief of Staff, the details of which have been worked out by his assistants. Who, then, in the entire Army would be in a better position to put them into effect? Whatever the future may hold for Marshall, whatever course he may be directed to follow, I can only visualize his great accomplishments and glory in the service of his country.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 23, 1943]

WE'RE FIGHTING A WAR—NO POLITICS!

Keep politics out of this war!

The soldiers of America now scattered over the face of the globe are not fighting and offering up their lives for the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or any other political group.

They are fighting for the preservation of this Nation and the right of human beings everywhere to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They are dying in battle to rid the earth of a scourge that threatens all that we hold sacred.

To use their valiance for partisan political purposes is to render mean and contemptible the supreme sacrifice many of them are making.

Wars are not won by newspaper headlines, by mouthing politicians on the rostrum, or by glib columnists and commentators.

Yet there are men in the Halls of our National Congress who are willing and eager to use this Armageddon of the human race for their own petty advantages.

This is the first war in the history of the United States for which we have been fully prepared.

Both President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, and Prime Minister Churchill have made their reports to their peoples through their legislative bodies, and, with pardonable pride, they have spoken of the achievements of the United Nations.

President Roosevelt paused in the writing of his message to pay special tribute to the tremendous tasks performed so magnificently by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Yet the ink is hardly dry upon the printed page of his report before cock-eyed rumors are sprung that Marshall is either to be deposed or kicked upstairs. These ugly rumors go on to explain that the reason for all this is that Marshall is not liked by the British because he does not see eye to eye with Churchill.

So, with the ill-logic of such people, it is further contended that he is to be placed in charge of the European war front—upon which will depend the very life of Great Britain.

If the English do not like Marshall, it stands to reason they would not accept him as the commander of their offense and defense. But logic has nothing to do with mean and petty politics.

In answer to this there comes another report that instead of being demoted the great American chief is to be made complete

commander of all Anglo-American forces throughout the world.

The Free Press makes no claims to omniscience. What was agreed upon at the Quebec conference we do not pretend to know, nor do we think it our business to know. Such matters must be sacredly secret. It is viciously unfair to these leaders and of great benefit to the enemy even to conjecture—and thereby start such wild rumors that can only be of disservice to the cause.

The Free Press has said before, and now repeats, that the Republican leaders who have tossed the honored name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur into the political arena, as a hope of winning an election, have done both him and the national cause an injury.

MacArthur is a soldier, not a politician. Nobody to this day knows what his political party affiliations are, if any.

He is naturally not unaware of this movement to make him the party leader of the Republicans. He has not repudiated it.

Therefore, anything that he now says is not taken as the word of a soldier dedicating his life to a mighty military cause. He is suspect immediately of political ambitions.

When he issues a statement from his southwest Pacific headquarters, as he did Tuesday, that he stands ready to play "a secondary role" and inferentially criticizes the program worked out by his commanding officers, we naturally think of the late great Gen. Billy Mitchell.

One of the chief criticisms of Mitchell was that he talked too much for publicity purposes and publicly criticized his superiors, a violation of the rigid military code of ethics and discipline. And Gen. Douglas MacArthur was on that trial board which condemned him to dismissal.

Not in the history of military literature is there a more poignant testimonial of a pledge than that given by General MacArthur upon his departure from the Philippines, that he would return. Nobody in his right senses has any idea that the Pacific war will be over by next summer. Therefore, how could MacArthur become a candidate for the Presidency without giving up the fight to which he has pledged his life?

A great soldier and a great patriot has been put in a false light by the political ambitions of a few Republican leaders.

And MacArthur's statement of Tuesday lends encouragement to their ambitions.

So far we have fought this war successfully because big men in both parties have submerged their differences and have fought shoulder to shoulder.

Now that victory is in sight—though far from won—it is no time to endanger that victory by breaking up a winning combination through discord wrought by selfish ambitions and cheap politics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, The Low-Down on Washington, with regard to the tax problem now before Congress—a very interesting and commendable article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as usual, this is one of our semiweekly vesper hours. In my humble opinion it serves a very useful purpose. Certainly it may be

a trespass upon the time of some, but it enables me to clarify my own thinking; in addition I hope it makes available some summarized historical information on problems that will confront us from time to time.

There is an impending issue; it is being formulated at this moment in the Committee on Banking and Currency. It might be styled an echo of the issue of that period just before we recessed when we were engaged in the battle of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the battle of subsidies. At the moment the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding a hearing. No bill has been introduced. It is being held upon a type-written bill, so neither you nor I unless you have had the good fortune to see this proposal may know what is in it. I made careful search at the document room to see whether a Member of another body whose name under the rules I cannot mention here had introduced the bill and I found that he had not. I found also that no Member of this body had introduced a bill; but the battle is in the making, and in a little while we shall be concerned once more with the whole question of subsidies as a part of our food program.

I sometimes wonder whether when we are dealing with these problems it would not be better after all to avoid rather than enact legislation of doubtful value. I recall that the first major depression in the history of the civilized world took place in Rome several thousand years ago. It came about when a broker in Rome had gotten a corner on all the purple dye and all the ostrich feathers in the known world. He went to the principal bank in Rome and there he negotiated a very substantial loan. The dye and ostrich feathers were imported from Phoenicia, or some other distant place. Unfortunately the vessel went down. The cargo was lost and there was no insurance as a hedge against that bank loan, and the first great major banking enterprise in the history of the civilized world failed, and there ensued out of that failure a depression. They did exactly nothing about it. They rode out that depression, and the world has ridden out every major depression from then on until the depression of 1929. The world went forward, some people were washed out, some businesses had to go through the wringer, which seems to be one of those inevitable incidents of an economic dislocation, but they finally came out and the world went on just the same. We have a new technique today. We must see what we can put on the books and how fast we can put it there. When I go back and read history, I try to evaluate all these enactments to see what good they did for our current problem and I often believe that too many of them did exactly no good considering the amount of the people's money that was invested therein.

We talk about this Commodity Credit bill, about the subject of food, and about all the things that we have done in the last 20 years or a little more. Perhaps a bit of summarized history will be of assistance. Our first agricultural de-

pression began in 1920; that is when we first began to hear about an agricultural depression and about proposals to meet it. In 1920, as you recall, we first lost our foreign markets, or at least they declined very substantially. Then there was a price collapse and then the farm depression began. That was 23 years ago. Now let us look at the 8-year period from 1920 on to see what was done by way of legislative efforts in order to meet that economic problem. In 1921 this Congress passed the so-called Packers and Stockyards Act. In 1921 there was organized a group that frankly I know nothing about, but the history books record that in 1941 there was organized in Congress the farm bloc.

In 1922 we had a national agricultural conference in Washington for the purpose of dealing with farm prices and farm supplies.

In 1922 Congress enacted the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and in the debates of that period an especial point was made and special emphasis was laid upon the fact that Congress had to set up some kind of restraint in order to prevent the dumping of foreign agricultural commodities on to our own markets.

In 1923 the Congress passed the Agricultural Credit Act.

In 1926 we first heard of hybrid corn, which gives us an increased yield and produces more vigorous varieties. In 1926 there was first proposed the so-called debenture export plan, commonly known in our political and congressional history as the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a vast difference between the debenture plan and the McNary-Haugen bill. They were not even related.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right. It was the export debenture plan that we first heard of in 1926. Then we heard also in 1926 of the McNary-Haugen plan, which was enacted in 1927 and vetoed.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about a farm bloc being organized back in those days. If he will search the record he will find that I made a speech on the floor of the House, as did other Members, inquiring who the farm bloc was and the only person we could find who was a member of it at that time was the man who advertised himself as the head of it, Mr. Dickinson of Iowa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that on so many occasions I have spoken about this mythical farm bloc. I know nothing about it either. But the current history back in 1921 indicates, and this you will find in literature of the Department of Agriculture, that a farm bloc was organized at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. That was the mythical farm bloc to which the gentleman refers. It was myth indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman and I thoroughly agree on that point.

In 1928 the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed the second time.

Then in 1929 there came the Federal Farm Board to deal with what? Believe it or not, to deal with surpluses. That is almost an archaic word, but that board was set up under Alexander Legge to deal with the question of surpluses, getting wheat out of the country or diverting it to relief channels as well as meeting the incipient farm panic in 1929.

When that second major farm depression came in 1929 there were other folks who had ideas on how to deal with it. A new program of legislation was then sponsored. First came the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, about which we have heard so much. Then came the Farm Credit Act of 1933, which was followed by the first Agricultural Adjustment Act and the creation of the first Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933. There came the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, and in that same year the President, by Executive order, created the Farm Security Administration.

There was also the Farm Credit Act of 1933 and the Farm Credit Act of 1935 which set up the so-called production-credit corporations and production-credit associations.

About this same time there was established the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation, with which we dealt only recently in the agricultural appropriation bill. We made provision for emergency seed and feed loans. We created an agricultural-marketing service. We passed the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, which was designed to increase trade with foreign countries and to expedite the export of farm products.

In the same year we passed the Silver Purchase Act, one of the greatest abominations that was ever inscribed upon the statute books by an intelligent Congress. The idea was, of course, to develop a greater flow of commodities to those countries that were on a silver basis. We thought it was going to work out, but the net result was we pushed China on to a managed-currency basis; it did not do Mexico or Bolivia any good, yet that act is still on the statute books of the Nation.

Then we set up a Cotton Stabilization Corporation in 1930.

There was the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. There was the Division of Subsistence Homesteads created by Executive order in 1933. There was the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation also created by Executive order in 1933, which later became the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation. Then there was created by Executive order the Resettlement Administration in 1935.

There was considerable jockeying with the so-called parity in all that period. Why was all this? It was only because somebody said that we had too much of everything, there was a great surplus in the world, a great surplus in this country, so there must be enactment by Congress and huge appropriations for the purpose of dealing with a surplus of

everything in the food line and for that matter in the fiber line.

We developed a real fear of our capacity. We went around shouting about the beneficences of the good earth that had produced so much as to cause a real national problem and, for that matter, a world problem. So we as intelligent legislators must address ourselves to the problem of dealing with too much, an amazing thing.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I just wonder if the gentleman has any data since the surplus has vanished of the liquidation of any of the agencies that were created while the surplus was on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman we have always had a surplus of Federal agencies, it seems, and we have not been particularly diligent in this body in abolishing a good many of them. Now and then by luck or circumstance we abolish one or two. We abolished the Civilian Conservation Corps. We worked for a few years and finally met with success in liquidating the National Youth Administration. Incidentally, there is a move on in the country right now to restore it, and a very distinguished Senator has introduced the bill to revive it. So it seems that when you do give them the death stab they do not stay dead. It means that we must be constantly vigilant if we are going to win in this great battle of the Congress versus the rising bureaucracy. So I say to the gentleman from Ohio, we will get to that in just a moment.

We were dealing with a surplus in 1932 and 1933 and from then on.

How did we propose to deal with it? Well, there was a fivefold attack. The first one was to produce less. And how do you produce less? You either shrink your tillable domain or you impose acreage restrictions so that you do not produce as much as you did before. That was attack No. 1.

Attack No. 2 was to export more, get the surplus out of the country if we could.

Attack No. 3 was to consume more, get it into channels of consumption if it were possible.

Attack No. 4 was new uses. I remember when I appeared on the Memorial Highway in 1933 with the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE and the Honorable Rexford Guy Tugwell and a great many other people for the purpose of developing an interest in the conversion of cereal grain into an alcohol of an anhydrous type which could be admixed with motor fuel for the purpose of giving us a premium motor fuel at a cheaper price, and at the same time getting rid of some of this monumental, overhanging, and disastrous surplus that they told us existed only 10 years ago. That was attack No. 4, namely, new uses.

Finally, there was the attack of holding it off the market, in storage, and then letting it feed under a control plan into the market so as not to shake the price structure too much.

What did we do in carrying out that fivefold attack? First, through the Agricultural Adjustment Act there were these restrictions on acreage accompanied by cash benefits.

Second, in exporting more we had trade agreements, we had the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, we set up the Export-Import Bank, and we set up the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.

Under attack No. 3, to consume more, we developed a program of relief purchases, a program of school lunches, and a program of food stamps. The amazing thing is that while we started out with food stamps for the folks in the low-income bracket we finally wound up by putting the whole Nation on food stamps, as you so well know today under O. P. A.

Under the proposal for new uses we created the four regional research laboratories in different sections of the country. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of those scientific men, who are the best men working for the Government today, that they are doing a very phenomenal job.

Finally, there was this technique of holding things off the market and feeding them in a little at a time, making it possible for the farmer to hold it under seal. That is where our old friend the Commodity Credit Corporation comes into the picture.

I started out with the premise that we do so much, and sometimes it is of doubtful value. The hand of Nature suddenly intervened for a couple of years. That great providential hand made the sun to shine brighter and longer, and the Architect of the Universe, for reasons best known to Himself, withheld the moisture. At one fell swoop Nature itself did more than all of the things we wrote upon the statute books for a 10-year period in reducing what they said was a great surplus of everything and too much of everything.

I am interested today in this one attack upon that problem of surplus because it is with us, it was with us in June, and it will be with us again in a little while, and every Member of this body who is here will be called upon once more to record himself on this question of extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with enough additional money out of the taxpayer's pocket or the loan power in order to subsidize the purchase and sale of farm products.

So that problem is with us, born in the days of surplus, when as a part of this attack the Commodity Credit Corporation was created to make loans to hold commodities off the market for the purpose of letting prices rise.

As I go back to that period there is one thing I ought to mention in that whole program, and that is the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. I never will forget an old gentleman from our side of the House who had a very brilliant mind, Representative Luce, of Massachusetts, who was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency, one of the most brilliant students in legislative history. I remember the day he stood here and prophesied that it would be a sorry day for this country, it would be

a distressing day for the world, when finally we took this country off the gold standard. I am not so sure but that old Bob Luce was right. But we took the country off the gold standard and it is still off; and maybe it will never get back on the gold standard. It may be that if we had retained a real monetary base such as we knew in other years and that helped us to weather other depressions we would have been infinitely better off. But we are off the gold standard today. That was part of the business of this attack of producing less, of exporting more, or consuming more, of filtering into the market a little bit at a time for the purpose of bringing the prices up. These many approaches whereby we tinkered with our fiscal structure to push prices up, or hold them or pull them down, brings to mind the story about the fellow who had that little mule that was balky and obstreperous and with which he could do nothing. This mule undertook to lie down on the pavement in the very center of town. He tried beating that mule over the nose. It did no good. He even resorted to building a fire under that little beast. It did no good. Finally the veterinarian came along and said, "Joe, what's the matter?" He said, "Can't do a thing with this mule." So the veterinarian reached in his case and got out one of these syringes and squirted something into that mule's hindquarters, and the little beast got up and started right off down the street. Joe watched the departing mule and said, "Doctor, how much was that?" "Oh, that will be about 10 cents." "Well," he said, "here is 30 cents. Give me two shots so I can catch that mule."

It can scarcely be denied that we were squirting little doses into the economic system to make prices go up, putting capstones on them at the time, holding them there, making them come down again. It took a rather rugged and virile kind of free-enterprise system to absorb the recurring shocks of what Congress tried to do for it and what Congress did to it. And yet it endured all this and still survives.

Is it any wonder that you got the civilian economy of this country out of gear? All that was done for what reason? Because there was too much, so they said. Well, was there? Not now. All in 10 years. I can stand here in 1943 and say, "Too much? Not now. But too little now." So now we are to be confronted with proposals now to deal with too little.

History is a very interesting thing, and historical cycles are interesting, indeed, as we go from too much to too little all in one single decade.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is quoting history quite liberally. Can he cite any instance in history where any price-fixing scheme has worked and has not resulted finally in some sort of disaster?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I can answer that in the affirmative or not without a little further

research. Perhaps the gentleman has done some special work in that field.

Mr. BUFFETT. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that I have studied a great many price-fixing schemes from Diocletian on down to the French Revolution, and a good many in this country, and none has ever succeeded in its intention, that I could find.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman has made an excellent historical statement upon the agricultural machinery with which we have attempted to solve some of the ills that beset the farmer. In mentioning the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the question just asked, the gentleman will agree with me, will he not, that the fixing of 85 percent of mandatory loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation did result in bringing farm prices more nearly to their just and equitable level?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. In a way, is that not a form of price fixing? Price support is a form of price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska asked about price fixing. That was the question of the gentleman from Nebraska—whether it was not true that over a period of time it hardened into permanency. I understood that to be his question.

Mr. MONRONEY. My understanding of his question was whether or not price fixing ever worked. I do recall that the instrumentality of using a strong support price, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, did result in farm prices going up from 80 percent of parity to 85 percent of parity overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We should understand ourselves about terms. Setting a floor under a price is not putting a ceiling on a price. We supported those prices.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg to disagree with the gentleman. If you are fixing a price, you are fixing it whether you are supporting a price or whether you are limiting a price. It is an instrumentality that works in either direction. Permitting merchandise to find its own price in a free market is not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not price fixing as this Congress has understood it. To put a floor under a price and let that price operate in a free economy above that floor is one thing, but a rigid price fixing is another. Setting a floor is quite another.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was going to say that I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress did not consider these commodity loans as price fixing, because that would have put us in the unhappy position of freezing the farmer's price at 85 percent of parity, which would mean it was the intent of Congress that the farmers for all time to come should be 15 percent short of cost of production, and our intention was not any such thing. So it was not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe our intention was to fix prices at 15 percent below parity.

Mr. MUNDT. It was an attempt to put a floor under prices, but not the fixation of a price.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have listened carefully to the gentleman enumerating the things that have been done to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did you say "for the farmers" or "to the farmers"?

Mr. RANKIN. I said "to the farmers." But I notice he seems to have studiously avoided the greatest thing that has ever been done for the American farmer, and that is rural electrification. I will say to the gentleman that the Mackinac conference, from the standpoint of the electric-light and power consumers of America, seems to have been a complete black-out. They overlooked the fact that the American people are more interested in that one question than almost any other economic issue at this time, and yet they did not even mention it. Not only did they not mention rural electrification, but they did not mention the power question at all. I am wondering if the gentleman is going to skip over rural electrification, the greatest development that has ever taken place for the benefit of the American farmer?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You see I have to bring my friend from Mississippi up to date. As a matter of fact, there were six subcommittees established by the action taken at Mackinac Island to deal with various phases of our fiscal and economic problems on the domestic front. That of course will include this question of rural electrification. So I am quite sure he is going to be very agreeably informed by the recommendations that will be made in due time by an appropriate committee handling rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give us the personnel of that committee and give us some indications as to what they are going to recommend? Are they going to remain in this blackout until after election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Those committees are taking thought of these various matters that have been assigned to them. One of the committees that I know of, because I happen to be a member, will probably have its first meeting some time in October over in Ohio for the purpose of dealing with one segment of that whole domestic problem.

I cannot name all of the men, but I think I can get the names for the gentleman. I may say to my good friend that he might address a letter to the National Republican Committee and I am sure they will be only too glad to give these names.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to get the name of the chairman of the committee and the recommendations that they have made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The recommendations have not as yet been made, I will say to my friend, but I expect they will be made before late January.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that the R. E. A. has been one of the finest accomplishments simply for this reason: Because of the price of commodities the farmers have found it necessary to work both day and night in order to make a living and therefore the R. E. A. gave them electric light to do their night work by.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In line with the suggestion of the other gentleman from Illinois, I suppose I should add that they are better off than they were under the Fordney-McCumber Act, when they were forced to work both day and night without light.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope the gentleman is going to get back to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, but I am fearful he may not, and I would like to ask him this question: I am definitely opposed to the so-called roll-back subsidies, of having the Federal Government pay a part of my grocery bill. On the other hand I recognize that there are times or that times may arise where subsidies are necessary.

I voted against the last bill we had in here, because I did not like to say to the President of the United States, when we were going home, that he could not put any plans into effect involving a subsidy on agricultural products.

I want to ask the gentleman this question because I know of no man who is better informed on that particular bill: Under that bill, as we passed it through the Congress before we recessed, has the President the power to secure corn and ship it into areas that are out of corn and to pay the freight which, in turn, would be a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would appear, as I recall the bill and its language, he could do that; he could do it within the limitations of the money that we approved; I am sure he could, because otherwise there would have been no necessity for making the money available.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You are of the opinion that he could do that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill, as I understand the gentleman to say, the President would not have been barred from using the funds for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so. As I remember that bill there was no reason for putting the money in if we had had that idea in mind.

Now getting back on the track for a moment. The thesis I want to establish first of all is that we were dealing with the problem of surpluses 10 years ago and putting all sorts of legislation on our statute books, and in the space of a decade it is a case of too little rather than too much, and so our problem now is one of rationing and of keeping production going and, according to the administration, to hold prices in line, and that is the basic purpose of the legislation that is pending in one of the committees today.

Now, did we ever have too much? They say there are 2,000,000,000 people in the world today and that two-thirds of them are suffering from malnutrition, not necessarily famine, but that they do not get enough of the right kind of foods to eat, to protect and safeguard their health and give the energy that is necessary to produce a livelihood. Perhaps there never was too much back even in 1933, and that it was a case of maldistribution in the world, rather than too much.

We are now up against this problem of providing food for our own people, for our soldiers, for our sailors, and for the people in occupied areas. We are told that food will be an offset to any kind of revolutionary virus and help us to restore order and reestablish decent and stable government. There is no question but what food is one of the most important munitions of war and one of the most important instrumentalities of peace. Our problem today is just one thing and nothing more: it is the problem of production. Everybody knows it. If our problem is too little food, the task before us is to produce more food. If prices get out of line, the answer is increased production to enable the balancing effect of supply and demand and bring about a readjustment.

In considering this matter let us examine for a moment the statistics released no later than September 30 by the Office of War Information. They are genuinely enlightening.

Never in the history of the Nation were national income and deposits at such levels as they are today and yet it is

proposed to meet our problems with borrowed money.

They point out that our estimated income for 1943 will be \$142,000,000,000. The O. W. I. said that the value of all goods and services available would be ninety and six-tenths billions, so that the excess of income over goods and services available would be fifty-one and four-tenths billions. Last year they said the difference was only thirty-four billions and now it is up to nearly fifty-two billions of excess funds for available goods and services. Another thing in which you would be interested is that the money in circulation has gone to eighteen and six-tenths billions. A year ago it was five billions below that figure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he gets away from the subsidy proposition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a subsidy when you pay a concern to manufacture articles on a cost-plus basis and it puts people on the pay roll and permits them to loaf around in order that the contractor may get this plus on their salaries? It not that a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and my friend will not get any quarrel out of me on that, because I mentioned here only the other day that where there was inefficient labor in some of these defense plants something should be done about it.

Where excessive profits occur through the operation of a defense plant, the matter can be cured by the use of the renegotiation power which Congress delegated to the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission. Inefficiency, however, and the inefficient use of manpower must be attacked in another way.

Getting back for a moment to this question of national earnings, the O. W. I. says that money in checking accounts amounts to thirty-five and seven-tenths billions; money in savings deposits—this is the O. W. I. figure of September 30—thirty billions. They talk about trying to repress and repel inflation; why inflation has been here a long time; there has been lots of inflation, and if you do not believe so go down and try to buy a sirloin steak.

The trouble is we have been dealing with symptoms rather than causes. The war expenditure every day amounts to \$286,000,000—every 24 hours. There is the great inflationary source; that is more than \$12,000,000 every 60 minutes, and as that money turns over and bids for the available services and goods in the country, that is the great dynamic force for inflation. So we are trying to deal with symptoms rather than causes; and that will be precisely the case with the bill that comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency that undertakes to invoke subsidies paid on borrowed money to be repaid by the soldiers and sailors who are beating out their energies in the Pacific and in Italy and the other combat areas; that will be there for them to pay back as the citizens who will shoulder the responsibility in the generation to come. That is the picture that is facing us today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. These banking figures do not mean anything, for when you give a man a credit on deposit there may be no money passed or deposited. The circulation statement of the United States Treasury of July 31, 1943, shows that we had in circulation in money on that date \$17,954,587,757. At the peak of prosperity following the other war, in 1920, we had only \$5,698,000,000 as against this \$17,954,000,000.

If agricultural prices were permitted to rise to their normal level at the source, cotton, wheat, corn, and dairy products would more than double at the farm. If the farmers were given the benefits that are enjoyed by others of the enormous amount of money in circulation, agricultural prices would more than double overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will observe to my friend from Mississippi that it depends upon which one of these two monetary theses you pursue: Whether it is a question of the velocity of goods and the velocity of the dollar on the one side or the quantity of money on the other. The quantity of money as such means nothing; it is the confidence of the people in their Government, in their administration that makes them go ahead and do business. When you get a dollar turning over 60 or 70 times that spells the difference between prosperity and adversity.

But I want to finish before my time runs out. That bill will probably be coming to this floor one of these days. You remember we solved this problem or left it in a state of suspended solution until the first of January. We have got to do something about it. It will be back here, it will be the same old struggle that we carried on in May and June, and what is the answer to this problem of too little goods and prices too high? It is produce, to produce more, and to produce still more, because the man who cannot get a pork chop will not have to care whether it costs him 20 cents a pound or 60 cents; he still cannot buy it, if it is not available. That is the essential thing today.

How shall it be solved? No. 1: Give the farmer some manpower. You cannot get more out of existing acreage or expand acreage in the country unless you have willing hands to do it. No. 2: There ought to be a greater liberality with steel so the farm machinery makers can manufacture more farm equipment. I talked with a steel man last night, and he says the steel situation is easing. I hope it eases very materially and that the War Production Board takes cognizance of it, and that there will be steel for farm machinery. No. 3: There must be fertilizer if it can be gotten. No. 4: There must be seed and, finally, there has got to be some profit incentive for the farmer to go out there and beat the soil day after day, early and late. There has got to be a livelihood for him, and the way to give him a livelihood is to peel off the restrictions, give him a fair price, and quit jockeying with this infernal parity business all the time, trying to snatch a little here and pinch off a little there until instead

of \$1.07 for corn, which he does not get, he gets \$1.07 minus a marketing charge and minus the freight rate to the nearest terminal.

If a farmer in my township sells corn, it does not make any difference to whom he sells it. The man next door might come and say he will buy it for \$1.07, and he will scoop it from the crib into his truck and say, "I will give you \$1.07 for it." If the selling farmer takes \$1.07 he violates the O. P. A. regulation and they are in fact pursuing farmers today who sold corn out in the Midwest because they did not sell at the ceiling price less that marketing charge, less the cost of transportation to the nearest terminal, even though a railroad or commercial truck never handled the corn.

This has been a rather sketchy recital and I want to summarize my own impressions of the problem before us.

Two decades ago, we saw the rise of apparent agricultural surpluses and rushed in to cure the problem with legislation.

A decade later, we encounter another depression, including the farmers, during which Congress rushed many diverse laws upon the books only to find that the balancing force of nature accomplished infinitely more than all the laws which Congress enacted.

Now we face a shortage instead of a surplus and once more the legislative tinkering will begin to solve the problem.

The problem is simple enough. It is production.

Whether we undertake to expand our farm domain and bring more acreage into cultivation or whether we undertake to get increased production out of each existing acre, the problem is precisely the same. It takes manpower, machinery, and good prices. This is neither mystical or magical. It is only common sense.

Yet manpower has been siphoned from the farms and adequate supplies of machinery have not been made available. How then shall we obtain increased production?

How much has been said about the "four freedoms." Others have added a fifth freedom called freedom of enterprise. Let's add one more. Let's include freedom for the farmer to produce—freedom from red tape, freedom from governmental restrictions and freedom from artificially generated forces which make it impossible for him to forecast from one day to another whether he will produce at a loss or a profit.

But notwithstanding the highest income on record in 1943; notwithstanding huge deposits, huge bond purchases, and a reduction in the available supply of goods and services, it is still proposed that we borrow money, buy whole crops of commodities, sell them at a price below the cost of purchase and charge the loss to the Federal Treasury. It is a bit ironical to think that people are buying bonds so that a portion of the general revenue can be employed to meet the losses which Government must take on the purchase and sale of commodities. What do you think?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MACKINAC CONFERENCE OR—MACKINAC BLACK-OUT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no one enjoys the rhetoric and the eloquence of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] more than I do.

I would like for him, however, to be a little more specific in the proposals that he has in mind for curing our economic ills. I listened very carefully to his discussion of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which to my mind was the beginning and probably the outstanding blunder of all of them. I listened to his discussion of the creation of these various agencies and these various policies, most of which I opposed. I even opposed the creation of the O. P. A. I believed then, and I believe now, that if we had followed the same policy we followed during the last World War we would not have had all the embarrassing and harassing situations that have grown up in every nook and corner of the country, and that today we would have more unity and less confusion.

But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in attributing all the ills to these various agencies overlooked the fact that in 1921 when his party had a majority of 169 members in this House and 23 in the Senate they imposed the highest protective tariff law ever known up to that time, in the history of mankind. It paralyzed agriculture to such an extent that it drove those sections of the country that must compete with the rest of the world into a state of bankruptcy to begin with. It provoked on the part of Great Britain the Beaverbrook tariff, sponsored, fostered, and pushed by Lord Beaverbrook who has just been appointed Ambassador to Russia, that virtually killed our trade with that country.

What was the result of those tariff policies? You had a tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat when we shipped out more wheat than we were shipping in and when wheat was 10 cents a bushel higher in Winnipeg, Canada, than it was in Minneapolis, Minn., just across the line. If you are going back to those paralyzing policies, under which the world became a barbed-wire entanglement of tariff barriers, behind which world trade became stagnant and world commerce became paralyzed, then I say that our struggles will have been in vain. It was only a short time after the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act until almost every country in the world retaliated against us. They first created the United States of Europe, consisting of some 23 nations. That was before Hitler and Mussolini broke out. They not only put on retaliatory tariffs, but they put on quotas, license requirements, and inspection fees, and then required that when you shipped American grain into those countries you had to mix 25 percent American grain with 75 percent native grain, making it virtually impossible for us to do business with the rest of the world.

When Mr. Hoover was elected in 1928, the situation was not improved. Let me say here that I have great admiration for Herbert Hoover as a man and as an American. I would not say anything to detract from his good name. However, he had never served in either House of Congress and seemed to take advice from someone on the outside who did not understand the cause of our troubles. Somebody talked him into advocating raising the tariff and making the statement that we were going to supply the rest of the world with manufactured goods.

Then Congress proceeded to pass the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, adding another load that broke the camel's back, and we had the crash of 1929 that continued until 1932. I will admit that the program that was adopted to try to cure it was wrong. We should have put recovery ahead of reform. That is what I wanted to do. I was coauthor of the Thomas-Rankin bill to give the President the power to issue \$3,000,000,000 in currency against the gold we had. We had ample gold, and still have. As a matter of fact, we had practically 60 percent of the world supply of monetary gold. If he had issued \$3,000,000,000 in currency against that gold and put it into circulation, then all these attempts to reform human nature, reverse the law of supply and demand and change or abolish our economic system would not have been necessary.

The country would have recovered its prosperity almost overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that in the first place I do not defend a great many of the things that have been done heretofore. The gentleman asked for a specific remedy. Why do we not let the Commodity Credit Corporation proceed with the authority they had in the first instance when created in 1933 to make loans to farmers so that they could hold their stuff, and let it go at that, instead of trying to inject a subsidy program at this time that will cost additional billions of borrowed money?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I took a good deal of abuse here because I opposed the bill that provided for killing pigs and plowing up cotton. Nothing ever hurt me worse than when I saw them go into my own field and plow up cotton that was already matured and open; because I realized that we were flying in the face of the economic laws, the laws of nature, and the laws of God. I have never been in favor of destroying anything in order to try to boost the price.

Here are two philosophies: First there is the philosophy of abundance, that has been preached to us by wise men since Biblical times, even by Moses himself. All through Holy Writ and down through the ages of history you will find that wise men have advocated the philosophy of abundance. On the other hand, you have the philosophy of scarcity, that has been advocated by a little selfish group—and I must say to the gen-

tleman from Illinois that your high protective tariff advocates fall within that category—the philosophy of squeezing production, squeezing supply, in order to raise prices, and benefit certain individuals or certain interests.

That is the line of demarcation today. On one side of it you have regimentation and scarcity; on the other side you have freedom and abundance.

Talk about the "four freedoms." One commentator said the other night that every convict in the penitentiary in his State had the "four freedoms." He had freedom from fear, because, he said, no matter how badly his enemies hated him they could not get in there to do anything to him. You know, the penitentiary sometimes is a great storm cellar for certain individuals.

He said the convict had freedom from want, because he could get all he wanted to eat and all he needed to wear. He said he had freedom of speech. He could say anything he pleased and nobody paid any attention to him. He said he had freedom of worship. He could pray to any God he wanted to, worship in any religion, and pray just as loudly and just as long as he pleased, and that he had a chaplain to assist him and a Bible to go by.

But the fifth freedom, the freedom to work, the freedom to conduct your own affairs, liberty if you please, is the freedom that Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, and Alexander Hamilton had in mind.

Whenever you impose a restriction, whether through a high protective tariff or the O. P. A., that unnecessarily cuts down production or distribution and imposes a policy of scarcity, on a nation of abundance, then you depart from those fundamental principles upon which this Nation must stand if it is to continue to be a great leader among the countries of mankind.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Now I want to talk to you just a moment about the greatest economic issue this country has ever seen, as far as the masses of our people are concerned, and that is the power issue. I read all the reports from Mackinac. Of course, I was familiar with the record of One World Willkie, the one-time fashion plate of the Power Trust, who now presumes to be a second Lincoln. I was familiar with his record, because I had fought him up and down the Tennessee Valley, and throughout north Mississippi, and especially in my own district, just as I have fought in the Electric Bond & Share up and down the Columbia River.

I know that we are moving into an electric age. I know that it is the greatest economic issue confronting the American people. Yet you had 19 Republican Governors at the Mackinac conference. The people of the States over which those Governors preside were overcharged for their electricity in 1942 amounts ranging from \$185,000,000 in New York down to \$3,534,665 a year in the State of Vermont. I will put the complete figures in the Record and name

them by States and name the Governor of each State.

CALIFORNIA

The State of California was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Warren.

In 1942 the people of the State of California were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$45,853,921, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$61,700,088, according to the Ontario rates.

COLORADO

The State of Colorado was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John Vivian.

In 1942 the people of the State of Colorado were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$10,032,575, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$11,493,451, according to the Ontario rates.

CONNECTICUT

The State of Connecticut was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Raymond Baldwin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Connecticut were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$24,868,268, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$28,442,103, according to the Ontario rates.

DELAWARE

The State of Delaware was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Walter Bacon.

In 1942 the people of the State of Delaware were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$3,116,365, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$3,565,713, according to the Ontario rates.

IDAHO

The State of Idaho was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen.

In 1942 the people of the State of Idaho were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,548,908, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$4,465,659, according to the Ontario rates.

ILLINOIS

The State of Illinois was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Green.

In 1942 the people of the State of Illinois were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$92,319,678, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$105,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

IOWA

The State of Iowa was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Bourke Hickenlooper.

In 1942 the people of the State of Iowa were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$20,999,241, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$24,164,248, according to the Ontario rates.

MAINE

The State of Maine was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sumner Sewall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Maine were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$8,500,739, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$9,694,372, according to the Ontario rates.

MASSACHUSETTS

The State of Massachusetts was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Leverett Saltonstall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Massachusetts were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$56,630,318, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$63,566,574, according to the Ontario rates.

MICHIGAN

The State of Michigan was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Harry Kelly.

In 1942 the people of Michigan were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$57,607,112, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$69,348,138, according to the Ontario rates.

MINNESOTA

The State of Minnesota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Thye.

In 1942 the people of the State of Minnesota were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$24,337,522, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$28,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

MISSOURI

The State of Missouri was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. F. C. Donnell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Missouri were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$27,230,943, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$32,175,217, according to the Ontario rates.

MONTANA

The State of Montana was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sam Ford.

In 1942 the people of the State of Montana were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,989,702, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$6,044,851, according to the Ontario rates.

NEBRASKA

The State of Nebraska was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Griswold.

In 1942 the people of the State of Nebraska were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$8,515,120, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$9,993,975, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The State of New Hampshire was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Robert Blood.

In 1942 the people of the State of New Hampshire were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$5,825,127, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$6,623,623, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW YORK

The State of New York was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In 1942 the people of the State of New York were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$185,460,625, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$206,608,500, according to the Ontario rates.

OHIO

The State of Ohio was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John W. Bricker.

In 1942 the people of the State of Ohio were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$69,270,721, according to the

T. V. A. rates, and \$82,776,491, according to the Ontario rates.

OREGON

The State of Oregon was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Snell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Oregon were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$7,127,731, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$9,605,692 according to the Ontario rates.

PENNSYLVANIA

The State of Pennsylvania was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Martin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Pennsylvania were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$95,175,358 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$112,773,228 according to the Ontario rates.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The State of South Dakota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe.

In 1942 the people of the State of South Dakota were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,191,208 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$4,652,372 according to the Ontario rates.

VERMONT

The State of Vermont was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. William Willis.

In 1942 the people of the State of Vermont were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$3,534,665 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$4,051,758 according to the Ontario rates.

WISCONSIN

The State of Wisconsin was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Andrew Goodland.

In 1942 the people of the State of Wisconsin were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$29,477,511, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$34,147,079, according to the Ontario rates.

CONCLUSION

What do these Governors propose for the relief of these overburdened power consumers in their respective States?

What does the Republican Party as a whole propose to do?

These are questions that must be answered unless the Mackinac conference is to go down in history as the Mackinac black-out.

Every State in this Union is financially better off than is the Federal Government. There is not a man here who will rise to deny that statement. These Governors all boast that their States are solvent, that they have money in the treasury. Many of them do not owe a dollar. Yet, not a one of those Governors raised his voice, as far as I have ever been able to find, in the interests of the power consumers of their own States, and not one of them has offered to aid in this great program of rural electrification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly will; and if the gentleman can point out one of these Governors who made any statement on

the power question, I certainly would be glad to have his name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that there really was no occasion to say anything particular, for this reason.

Mr. RANKIN. They talked about everything else, pertaining to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman wants the facts?

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one general statement on foreign policy. There was a general statement on domestic policy. It was left to the various subcommittees that were created to spell out the various items for the agenda of those various subcommittees.

Mr. RANKIN. In those various reports that I read—and they were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here—you discussed everything pertaining to the farmer except the one thing in which he is most vitally interested, and that is rural electrification. I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Illinois, for he is not a governor; but I want to get him straight before he gets too far off the track.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just want to make clear that there was a statement to the general effect that they wanted to preserve the freedom of the American farmer and supply him with the instrumentalities that are necessary to a decent living and effective production. It was not the purpose of that council to go any further than that. The specific recommendation will be made at some subsequent time.

Mr. RANKIN. If their statements on these issues are as innocuous or as silent in the future, they might as well not go to the farmers of the country, because those farmers are more interested in rural electrification than in anything else that has been advocated in your day and mine.

When first I came to Congress, back in those glorious days when the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was levying a tax on everything the farmer bought, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age was laid away, during those boom days of alleged Harding-Coolidge prosperity, the American people were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatts of electricity a year. This year, 1943, they will use 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five times as much. My prediction is that unless some selfish interests get control and continue to strangle the American people with exorbitant rates, within 10 years after the close of this war they will be using 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of undeveloped water power now going to waste, flowing wanton to the sea, for which we get absolutely nothing. We could harness that water power, give the people the benefit of it, and make it pay for its development in a generation.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not seeking personal credit. Some people have exerted themselves very much to keep me from getting credit even for my coauthorship of the act creating the Tennessee Valley

Authority. I noticed the other day a great deal of publicity about who was responsible for raising the soldiers' pay to \$50 a month. Everybody in the House, and all the soldiers, know that I not only introduced that amendment but stayed with it and fought it through. I started the rural electrification fight in my own district, in my home county. We worked out a program that has been adopted and spread to the rest of the country. These cooperative associations are independent; they are not subject to control by any Federal agency. They are controlled by the farmers themselves. In 1935, 2 years after I started this rural electrification program, we had only 10 percent of our farms electrified—and they were largely suburban farms, near town. Germany had 90 percent, Sweden and Norway had 90 percent, France and Italy had 94 percent, Holland and Switzerland had 100 percent of their farms electrified at that time, and even Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified. New Zealand, a far-away, new, and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified. After 8 years of hard struggle in which we have been joined by farmers, Democrats, Republicans, and independents in every State in this Union, our program has been carried on without regard to party politics, and we have raised the percentage of American farms electrified from 10 percent to 38 percent.

If we are going to have independent farmers in the years to come, if we are going to have farmers who are to enjoy the comforts and conveniences of modern life, everything from electric lights to electric irons, electric fans, radios, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators, water pumps, milking machines and cold-storage facilities, and all the other conveniences that electricity will bring, I submit we are going to have to have a more pronounced and positive policy than I found in the reports of the Mackinac conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Bruce K. Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. Josephus Daniels on September 26 entitled "Congress and the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORLD-WIDE AVIATION

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] has requested that this telegram from Donald W. Douglas, of the Douglas Aircraft Co., which is in his congressional district, be placed in the RECORD as an extension of remarks.

With the permission of the House, I shall read the telegram at this time:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., September 21, 1943.

S. J. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Airlines Committee for
United States Air Policy,
Washington, D. C.:

You have my permission to release contents of my letter September 13 which read as follows:

"I have studied with great interest the declaration of policy of world-wide aviation as advocated by the 16 signatory air lines. It is my firm belief that the basic policy involving free competition under reasonable governmental regulation will be necessary to insure the development of a sound and efficient post-war foreign air-line system. I pledge my active support to the over-all effort now being put forth to assure American supremacy in international air-line operation through the American principle of competition."

DONALD W. DOUGLAS,
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this telegram may be included in the Appendix as the extension of remarks of the gentleman from California, Mr. WILL ROGERS, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VURSELL was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURCH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, October 7, 1943, on general bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10

a. m., on Monday, October 11, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for their payment, amounting to \$84,991.83 (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a record of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of \$3,178.83 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

777. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of \$12,997.86, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (34 U. S. C. 599), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission of the Office of Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$17,043,000 (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to \$17,546,700 (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$2,880.82, as covered by a certificate of settlement, the number of which is shown in the first column of the attached schedule (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Federal Security Agency to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Public Health Service, in the sum of \$60, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which requires an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of \$10,705.19 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the Department of Commerce (Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics), amounting to \$3,081,000 (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

784. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supple-

mental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$4,427,550 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

785. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to \$517,126.42, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

786. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of \$253.58 which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and which requires an appropriation for its payment (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of \$3,061.09, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which require an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of \$22,622.70, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

790. A letter from the Chairman, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the period ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

791. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of determinations made by him during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 as to the numbers of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

792. A letter from the Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a form setting forth information in response to questions Nos. 1 and 5, in accordance with instructions in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421 of May 31, 1943, for the use of the Bureau in determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period October 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

793. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

794. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

795. A letter from William H. McReynolds, administrative assistant to the President, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

796. A letter from the Commissioner of the Budget, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Office of Budget and Administrative Planning, Migratory Bird, and Expenses of Loans, supplementing the estimates sent under date of September 28, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

797. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting Bureau of the Budget Forms No. 80-R-001.1 for the War Manpower Commission, exclusive of the Bureau of Selective Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

798. A letter from Frank K. Sanderson, administrative officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the White House office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

799. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

800. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of supplemental materials which were presented to the Bureau of the Budget in support of requests for personnel needs during the first quarter of fiscal 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

801. A letter from the Director, Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

802. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

803. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3374. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1 of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3375. A bill to support the price of cotton at 40 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3376. A bill to provide that during the present war all persons in the armed

forces shall have in force national service life insurance in the amount of \$5,000 without the payment of premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3378. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3379. A bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3380. A bill to provide for the issuance and award of a Civil Air Patrol Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to credits against the victory tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3382. A bill to enable disabled veterans to accept employment during the war period without deductions from their pensions or compensation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3383. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3385. A bill for the relief of Mary Keegan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Robert Caven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of William R. Weathers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and for the three children of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the late William Edward Cothron, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Gladys Mary White; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Crane; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2640. By Mr. FLOESER: Petition of H. C. Mueller's liquor store and 45 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2641. Also, petition of Emil W. Mueller and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2642. Also, petition of Peter Yanczer and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2643. Also, petition of William J. Hemmen and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2644. Also, petition of George J. Amsler and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2645. Also, petition of Joseph L. Gobbert and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2646. Also, petition of Herman F. Prange and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2647. Also, petition of Paul V. Neidhart and 16 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2648. Also, petition of Edward C. Bolm, Sr., and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2649. Also, petition of Norman Cook and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2650. Also, petition of John F. Telthorst and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2651. Also, petition of Christanich Anton and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2652. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from B. K. Leach, of St. Louis, Mo., Allen K. Swann, of Evansville, and Walter Duncan, Jr., of Mount Vernon, Ill., favoring the immediate passage of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil in order to stimulate the much-needed production of same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2653. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Rotary Club of Albion, Ill., urging the immediate consideration of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude petroleum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2654. Also, communication from Jarvis Bros. and Marcell, of Decatur, Ill., supporting House bill 3203, in order to stimulate the much-needed production of oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2655. Also communication from G. C. Curtis, superintendent of oil conservation of Illinois, urging the adoption of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2656. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Theodore H. Kefrig of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2657. Also, petition of Angelo Stargars and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2658. Also, petition of John William Hoemeke and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2659. Also, petition of Mary Capstick, of Normandy, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2660. Also, petition of employees of Procter & Gamble, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of the United Shoe Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local 56A, and signed by 124 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2662. Also, petition of Elmer E. Taylor, of St. Louis, Mo., and 45 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2663. Also, petition of Bernard Kauling, of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2664. Also, petition of George E. Wilhelm and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2665. Also, petition of Richard S. Lowe, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2666. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. Arthur Neiderbeiser, president, the Ruth Bible class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Holidays Cove and Weirton, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2667. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco City and County Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to national sugar emergency, and urging Congress to exert full efforts to bring about an announcement by the War Food Administration of an effective program and policy as regards beet sugar, on or before October 1, 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2668. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of Lewis Nelson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and 27 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2669. Also, petition of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., and 154 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2670. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin D. Liss and 69 others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2671. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pratt, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, at the day's beginning we pause to bow our hearts at this shrine of our spirits. We would silence tense emotions, calm stormy passions, that we may be still and know that Thou art God. Without Thee even our radiant hopes for humanity are like withered leaves—once bright with sunshine which change to brown and crumpled ruins, blown upon a bitter wind.

O God, save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to be men of lost faith. Help us to see that way madness lies and the surrender of all that gives life worth and loveliness and grace. Join us in spirit to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For, as in humility we turn to Thee, we remember that we date this day's deliberations from the lowly cradle of one who died on a cruel cross, mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged; yet that cross of torture sways the future. By its crimson sign may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids;

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and